MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XL JANUARY, 1925 NUMBER 1

CHARACTERS IN MEDIEVAL LITERATURE

There has been little discussion concerning characterization in Medieval literature.[1] The average critic would probably assume that, with some few exceptions, it is negligible; and he would probably add that the great lack was in realism.[2] Chaucer's Canterbury pilgrims stand out in sharp contrast to their background, only to be explained with reference to their author's genius. In studying the seventeenth century "character," Mr. Henry Morley

[1] Studies that I have found useful include the following: "The Character Types in the Old French *Chansons de Geste*," by W. W. Comfort, *PMLA.* XXI, 279 ff.; "Character in the 'Matter of England' Romances," by H. L. Creek, *JEGP.* X, 429 ff., 585 ff.; "The Middle English Ideal of Personal Beauty, as found in the Metrical Romances, Chronicles, and Legends of the XIII, XIV, and XV Centuries," by W. C. Curry, Baltimore, 1916; and "Die Charakterzeichnung bei Chaucer," by E. Meyer, Halle, 1913, Morsbach's *Studien*, XLVIII.

[2] A discriminating statement is that of Charles S. Baldwin in his *Introtroduction to English Medieval Literature*, London and N. Y., 1914, p. 65: "The heroes of epic, more like the real men that we know, are more distinct from one another, Achilles from Ulysses, Beowulf from Hrothgar. The heroes of romance, somewhat indifferently endowed with all manly virtues, are all very much alike, Lancelot like Gawain, Gareth like Percival." This opinion is at the bottom of much of the discussion in Ker's *Epic and Romance*. Speaking of the romances, Professor Saintsbury has observed: "The motive-and-character-interest is rarely utilised as it might be," *The English Novel*, London, 1913, p. 24. It would be easy to add other quotations to the same point. The justice of this position is, however, seriously open to question. There are many realistic characters in romance, if we use "romance" in a broad sense, and if we take into account their action,—from Guinivere and Iseult of the White Hands to Grim, Gamelyn, Sir Kay, and the butcher who appears in *Octavian*. The tradition of the different figures is occasionally obscured by changes and additions; but to the man in the Middle Ages the heroes were identified by certain generally fixed traits. This is not the place to take up the question of motivation.

observed that, "The first and best sequence of 'Characters' in English Literature is the series of sketches of the Pilgrims in the Prologue to Chaucer's 'Canterbury Tales.' The characters are so varied as to unite in representing the whole character of English life in Chaucer's day, and they are written upon one plan, each with suggestion of the outward body and its dress as well as of the mind within. But Chaucer owed nothing to Theophrastus.[3] In his Character Writing he drew all from nature with his own good wit."[4] In other words Chaucer's technique is unexplained by anything in the literature of his own times.

There is hardly room for argument about the fact that the General Prologue of the Canterbury Tales drew considerably upon nature; that even local and personal allusions were introduced to an astonishing degree,—perhaps in such cases as the Shipman's boat, the "Maudeleyn," and the very mormal on the Cook's shin. But it is now just as well known that the poet culled some flowers from the works of his contemporaries, in the fashion of his day; and we have been convincingly taught that the Prioress owes some of her worldliness to La Vielle in the *Roman de la Rose,* even as the Parson derived some of his piety from the *Roman de Carité.* Sometimes indeed the most baldly realistic material comes from the treatises of the physiognomists, unless we may suspect that many of these echoes are due to the coincidence that in both cases the details were taken from real life. The fact that each pilgrim is the best of his kind, or the extreme of his type, may possibly be due to the mannerism of Medieval romantic literature, whereby each hero is the bravest, each heroine the fairest.[5] But while the

[3] There is no evidence that he knew the Characters. He used the fragment of the *Liber de Nuptiis* which is preserved in Jerome.

[4] *Character Writings of the Seventeenth Century*, London, 1891, p. 17.

[5] It would be futile to list many instances, but in a short time I have collected the following: *Havelok*, ed. Skeat and Sisam, Oxford, 1915, p. 36; *Morte Arthure*, ed. Björkman, Heidelberg, 1915, ll. 75-76; *Roman de Troie*, ed. Constans, Paris, 1904, *SATF.*, I, 265, ll. 5100 ff.; *Partonope of Blois*, ed. Bödtker, London 1912, *EETS. ES.*, p. 4; Chrétien's *Cligès*, ed. Foerster, Halle, 1921, ll. 447 ff.; the *Thornton Romances*, ed. Halliwell, 1894, Camden Society, p. 88, ll. 10 ff.; p. 122, ll. 29-30; p. 177, ll. 13 ff.; Ritson, *Romances*, London, 1802, I, p. 1, ll. 11-12; p. 171, l. 35; II, p. 1, ll. 10; p. 91, ll. 10; p. 156, ll. 8; p. 205, l. 30; pp. 249 ff., ll. 39 ff.; III, p. 3, l. 39; p. 95, ll. 38; p. 146; l. 30; Weber, *Romances*, Edinburgh, 1810, I, p. 331, ll. 13-14;

subject-matter may be thus accounted for, Chaucer's "characters" remain unique in *form*,—as extensive but very compact summaries of descriptive detail and of traits of character, in which the use of what is concrete and realistic is striking. What I wish to show now is: (1) that such descriptions are found in the early treatises on vice and virtue, and in the allegories; and (2) that in this way realism may have found its way into literary art in general in this period.

Medieval romance, it is true, furnishes a variety of portrayal which catalogues the hero's or heroine's features by the inventory method.[6] In this kind of literature, however, characterization is usually effected dramatically,—a method which is more appropriate and more subtle. Even the portraits are sometimes given in action, so to speak, as when we read of the appearance of Queen Olympias riding through the town in *Kyng Alisaunder*.[7] Descriptions which combine character and appearance are found only sporadically; those which have much length are rare.[8] Furthermore the specific

II, p. 4, ll. 31; p. 282, ll. 32; p. 371, l. 50; III, p. 159, ll. 45-46. This feature is well known to students of romance, and therefore the present search, I confess, has not been systematic. For other notes to a similar effect, see Creek, *op. cit.*, p. 444, note 24; and (on the fifteenth century limitation to this formula) Curry, *op. cit.*, p. 11. For the pure superlative, the variant "fairer [braver] none might be" sometimes occurs; this I have included in my list.

[6] Familiar instances are the description of Briseida in Dares, that of the ghost in the *Awntyrs off Arthure*, and that of the Green Knight in *Gawayne and the Grene Knight*. One remarkable form appears in Chrétien's *Cligès*, ll. 811 ff. This method goes back at least to the Alexandrian Greek romance-writers: see Ogle, *MLN.*, XXVII, 241. For such use of detail in Chaucer see Meyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 2-3; and note instances in other poets referred to in *Anglia*, XXXIII, 440 ff.

[7] Weber, *Romances*, I, pp. 12 ff., ll. 155 ff. Other descriptions given through action are as follows: *Erec*, ed. Foerster, Halle, 1909, ll. 1593-1672; *Roman de Troie*, I, pp. 62 ff., ll. 1230 (1218) ff. Another and equally skillful type of description is that given through the effect on an observer: see, e. g., Calogrenant's description of Sir Kay, *Yvain*, ed. Foerster, 1913, ll. 113 ff.; cf. *Erec*, ll. 1484 ff.

[8] By all odds the most remarkable collection that I have noticed is that of the gallery of portraits in the *Roman de Troie*, I, pp. 263 ff. Note, e. g., that of Troilus, p. 281, ll. 5393 (5373) ff.:

> Troïlus fu beaus a merveille;
> Chiere ot riant, face vermeille,

data which are afforded with regard to character are frequently conventional and vague. Take, for instance, what the romance of *Octavian* gives us:

He was a man of grete fauour,
He leuyd in yoye and greet honour,
And doughty was in dede.
In turnament and yn fyght
Yn the worlde was not a bettur knyght
Then he was vndur wede:
Octavyan hys name hyght,
He was a man of moche myght,
And bolde at euery nede.[9]

Legends and other religious narrative contribute no steadier tra-

---

Cler vis apert, le front plenier:
Mout covint bien a chevalier.
Cheveus ot blonz, mout avenanz,
E par nature reluisanz,
Ieuz vairs e pleins de gaieté.
Onc ne fu rien de lor beauté. Etc.

Of characterization in the romances, Curry remarks: "Tho this tendency to develop character at the expense of personal description is felt most strongly in the chronicles, yet it prevails also to a large extent in the romances as well," *op. cit.*, p. 5. His examples are, in general, very brief. He has already said that in the romances "the one-, two-, and three-line descriptions are by far most common, yet more detailed presentations of beauty are sometimes given," *ibid.*, p. 4.

[9] Ed. Sarrazin, Heilbronn, 1885, *Altengl. Bibl.*, p. 64, ll. 16-24. Cf. the description of Jason, *Roman de Troie*, I, pp. 38 ll. 727 (715) ff.:

Icist Eson un fil aveit
Qui Jason apelez esteit
De grant beauté e de grant pris
E de grant sen, si com jo truis.
Grant force aveit e grant vertu,
Par maint regne fu coneü;
Mout fu corteis e genz e proz
E mout esteit amez de toz;
Mout por demenot grant noblece
E mout amot gloire e largece;
Trop ert de lui grant reparlance,
E tant aveit fait dès enfance
Que mout ert coneüz sis nons
Par terres e par regions.

See also the *Roman de Thèbes*, ed. Constans, Paris, 1890, I, pp. 279 ff., ll. 5717 ff.

dition in this respect;[10] and there was really nowhere in these fields any motive which inevitably led the author to describe and characterize his figures in the somewhat deliberate manner of Chaucer's Prologue.

In the treatises on vice and virtue and in the allegories there was a necessity to do just this,—to list qualities and traits in order to set forth a familiar human type. These documents were forced to reflect real life in order to point their moral. Here the descriptions of personified Avarice, Envy, Sloth, and the like, anticipate Chaucer's portraits and the seventeenth century "character" in a remarkable way.

The original suggestion for such a treatment may have been found in a Biblical discourse like that on Charity in First Corinthians, thirteen: "Charity suffereth long and is kind; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up," etc. What is reasonably the most primitive form is hardly more than a definition, of which an example appears in the Kentish or Southeastern *Vices and Virtues*:—

. Temperantia is an oðer hali mihte, ðe cann swiðe michel scile and mæðe of alle kennes þinge. Hie ne wile ðoliȝen non ouerdon þing; an oðer halue, ne to litel ne to michel. Se ðe hire ræd hlesten wile, ne scal he noðer eten to michel, ne drinken to michel, ne to litel; ne he ne scall resten ne slapen to michel, ne to litel; ne he ne scal to michel bien spekende, ne to michel swigende; ne he ne scal

[10] Cf., however, the following from the *South English Legendary*, ed. Horstmann, London, 1887, p. 368, ll. 61 ff.:

Ake þus ȝe him mouwe i-knowe: ȝif ȝe him i-seo:
he is swiþe long of bodi: of riȝt fair fourme and freo,
Opriȝt he geoth and euene i-novȝ: and swiþe ȝwiȝt is his bleo,
his her is broun and swiþe crips: non ne mai cripsore beo,
Muchele eyȝene and euene nose: i-streiȝt a-doun a-long,
his berd is long and sid i-nouȝ: and sum-del hor among;
In a ȝwiȝt Golioun he geth: he nath cloþes non mo. Etc.

In this there is no characterization; pure characterization appears in the portrait of Daniel in the *Vices and Virtues*, ed. Holthausen, *EETS.* LXXXIX, 1888, p. 43:

Naðelæs, ouer alle þing he luuede under gode abstinenciam, castitatem, þat is, wiðhealdnesse of metes and of drenches, and of alles kennes galnesses. Ne mihte him naðer befelen. Swa swa he was on kynges hyrde lange ifedd and ȝefostred, leuere him was to eten benen and pesen and swilche unorne metes, and ðat water to drinken, ðanne him ware ðo derewurðe sondes ðe comen fro ðe kynge. Etc.

to prudeliche bien iscredd, ne to unorneliche, ne he ne scal bien to glad, ne to sori.[11]

A more advanced form is found in the *Ancren Riwle,* in the famous passage regarding flatterers and backbiters:—

Iherest tu hu Salomon eueneð bacbitare to stinginde neddre? So heo is sikerliche. Heo is neddre kundel: *ant* þeo þet speked vuel bihinden berð atter in hire tunge. Þe vikelare ablent þene mon *ant* put him preon in eien, *þet* he mid vikeleð. Þe bacbitare cheoweð ofte monnes fleschs ine uridawes, *ant* bekeð mid his blake bile o cwike charoines ase þe þet is þes deofles corbin of helle. Yet wolde he teteren *ant* pileken, mid his bile, roted stinkinde fleshs, as is reafnes kunde: þet is, ȝif he uolde siggen non vuel bi non oðer bute bi þeo *þet* rotieð and stinkeð al ine fulðe of hore sunnen, hit were ȝet þe lesse sunne; auh lihted upon cwike fleschs, tetereð *ant* tolimeð hit . . . . He is to ȝiuer reafen *ant* to bold mid alle. Etc.[12]

This is but a small part of the whole account.

[11] *Op. cit.*, p. 107. See also the description of Honestas, p. 133; cf. Providentia, p. 103. For another definition see *Jacob's Well*, ed. Brandeis, *EETS.* CXV, London, 1900, pp. 69 ff. [MS. about 1440]; and the *Lay Folk's Catechism*, *EETS.* CXVIII, London, 1901, pp. 88 ff. Cf. Chaucer's Parson's Tale, *Complete Works*, ed. Skeat, Oxford, 1900, IV, p. 616, Lachesse.

[12] Ed. Morton, Camden Soc., LVII, 1853, pp. 82 ff. For the flatterers, see p. 86:

Uikelares beoð þreo kunnes. Þe uorme beoð vuele inouh: þe oðre þauh beoð wurse: þe þridde ȝet beoð alre wurste. þe uorme, ȝif a mon is god, preiseð hine biuoren himself, *ant* makeð hine, inouh reðe, ȝet betere þen he beo, *ant* ȝif he seið wel, oðer deð wel, he hit heueð to heie up mid ouerpreisunge *ant* herunge. þe oðer is ȝif a mon is vuel, *ant* seið *ant* deð so much mis *þet* hit beo so open sunne *þet* he hit ne mei nonesweis allelunge wiðsiggen: he þauh, biuoren þe monne sulf makeð his vuel lesse. "Nis hit nout nu, he seið, so ouer vuel ase me hit makeð. Nert tu nout, i þisse þinge, þe uorme, ne þe laste." Etc. "Sie ist die erste nicht"! Cf. also the backbiter, p. 88:

Weorpeð adun þet heaueð, *ant* foþ on uor te sike er he owiht sigge: *ant* makeð drupie chere: bisaumpleð longe abuten uor te beon þe betere ileued. Etc.

For other material, see: the proud, p. 210; the wrathful, p. 212; the sluggard, p. 212; the covetous, p. 214; the lecherous, p. 216. Miss Hope Allen, who regards the Middle English version as a translation, puts the date much earlier than preceding scholars have: "several years after 1134," possibly in the reign of Stephen, *PMLA.* XXXIII, 509 ff. In relation to this should be consulted "The Original Language of the *Ancren Riwle*," by D. M. E. Dymes, *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, IX, Oxford, 1924, pp. 31 ff.

The finished Character, however, is less symbolic than this. It depends more on observation, and strives more definitely to reproduce what is recognizable human nature. I shall give only a few examples out of many, the first being again taken from the *Ancren Riwle*:—

Þe ȝiure glutun is þes feondes manciple. Uor he stikeð euer iðe celere, oðer iðe kuchene. His heorte is iðe disches: his þouht is al iðe neppe: his lif iðe tunne: his soule iðe crocke. Kumeð forð biuoren his Louerde bismitted *ant* bismeoruwed, a disch ine his one hond, *ant* a scoale in his oðer: maðeleð mid wordes, *ant* wigeleð ase uordrunken mon þet haueð i-munt to uallen: bihalt his greate wombe, *ant* te ueond lauhweð þet he to bersteð.[13]

Here is something of the flavor of Bishop Hall's collection. Another example may be found in Dan Michel's *Ayenbite of Inwyt*, that of the Envious Man:—

Þe enuious ne may ysy þet guod of oþren nanmore þanne þe oule oþer þe calouwe mous þe briȝtnesse of þe zonne. . . . Þe herte of þe enuious ys enuenymed and suo miswent. þet he ne may oþre manne guod yzy þet hit him ne uorþingþ wyþinne þe herte. and demþ kueadliche. and þet he yziȝþ oþer þet he yherþ: nimþ hit to kueade wytte and of al makeþ his harm . . . . Efterward þanne þe enuious y-herþ oþer yzyþ oþremanne kued huet þet hit by oþer kuead of bodye ase dyaþ oþer ziknesse. oþer kuead of auenture [hap.] ase pouerté oþer aduersité. oþer kuead gostlich ase huanne he yherþ þet zome þet me hyelde guode men: ys y-blamed of zome vice. Of þelliche þinges him gledeþ ine his herte. Etc.[14]

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 214.

[14] Ed. Morris, *EETS.* XXIII, 1866, pp. 27 ff. Cf. the French of Frére Lorens, ff. XVII (I have used the fifteenth century MS. deposited in the Harvard Library):

Car li enuieux ne puet voir le bien dautruy. ne que la suete. ne la chauue ansuyȝ la clarte du soleil. . . . Le cuer de lenuieux est si enuenimeȝ et si bestorneȝ que il ne puet a aultrui bien voir. quil ne len poise dedens le cuer et juge mauueisement ce que il voit et ce *que* il oit, et prant tousiours en mauueis sens et de tout fait son domage. Tant ha on cuer de lenuieux de pensees enuenimees de fauls jugemens que en ne le porroit nombrer. Etc., f. XVII vo.

The *Ayenbite* offers several good Characters: see the glutton, pp. 50 ff.—

God him hat ueste: þe wombe zayþ 'þou ne sselt ac et longe and a-trayt.' God him hat be þe morȝen arise: þe wombe zayþ 'þo ne sselt ich am to uol me behoueþ to slepe.' Etc.

See p. 56 also. For flatterers see pp. 61 ff. Note on pp. 135 ff. the Character of a virtue, the Truly Mild:

Efterward þe zoþe milde worþssipeþ god and him byt mildeliche. þet

A third (on the same subject for the sake of comparison) may be taken from *Handlyng Synne* by Robert of Brunne:—

Enuyus man is so ful of susspecyun
þat euyl hym þenkeþ al, as a felun.
who-so kan knowe þe properte,
Enuyus man may lyknyd be
To þe Iawnes, þe whyche ys a pyne
þat men mow se yn mennys yne.
þe ye þat ys ful of Iawnes,
Alle þenkeþ hym ȝelogh yn hys auys:
So hyt fareþ on hys party,
Hys þoght ys euer ful of enuye.
Enuyus men, euyl þey sowe;
þat men telle hem, to euyl þey trowe;
ȝyf þey se þat one doth more
Enuyus þan angreþ sore.[15]

It continues at much greater length to expound the weaknesses of Envious.

There is considerable skill in some of these descriptions. They are found with even more detail and artistry in the allegories, where, although the same ideas are often presented, the realism

his to zigge mid zoþe teares þet comeþ of godes grace and mid riȝtuolle oninge of herte. Vor hit him þingþ þet he is ase þet child þet is echedaye beuore his maistre and naȝt can his lessoun. Etc.

Virtues are sometimes characterized, but the material is notably less realistic. Vice is always easier to make realistic, as one can observe by studying the product of the schools of realism, and by noting the great sinners in literature, from Hagan in the *Nibelungen Lied*, Ganelon, and Milton's Satan, down through the literature of roguery and the cult of the criminal to Don Juan, Faust, and other modern instances.

[15] Ed. Furnivall, *EETS.* CXIX, 1901; CXXIII, 1903. P. 135, ll. 3971-84. Cf. the French from the *Manuel*, ll. 3913 ff.:

Tant est plein de suspeciun
Qe mal quide partut li felun. Etc.

Note also Backbytere, *Handlyng Synne*, ll. 4169 ff.; the Slothful Rich, 4241 ff. From the latter I shall quote a few lines, 4283 ff.:

To hym þat kalled, he speke þ stoutly
'What deuyl! why haþ þe prest swych hy?
Byd hym þat he abyde algate;
Hym dar nat syng ȝyt ouer late.'
For hym shal so Goddys seruyse abyde
Tyl hyt be passed ouer þe tyde. Etc.

Cf. the French, ll. 4127 ff.

is still further developed. Whether the writers actually went to the treatises, and borrowed the form and the material for their own purposes, it would be difficult to prove; but there seems to be a relationship of some kind. In the allegories it was necessary to give tangible substance to the personified abstractions,[16] and here was a ready means. The *Roman de la Rose* offers examples of this development: I shall quote one or two from the Middle English translation which was, for a long time, attributed to Chaucer. Here the Lover sees many images on the Garden Wall, portraits of the Sins displayed for the edification of the passerby.

Another image set saugh I
Next Coveityse faste by,
And she was cleped Avarice
Ful foul in peynting was that vice;
Ful sad and caytif was she eek,
And also grene as any leek.
So yvel hewed was hir colour,
Hir semed have lived in langour.
She was lyk thing for hungre deed,
That ladde hir lyfe only by breed
Kneden with eisel strong and egre;
And therto she was lene and megre.

[16] The allegories sometimes fail to distinguish between the personified abstraction (in the form of a type) and the symbolic figure that bestows the quality of the abstraction. Note the symbolic element in the following description of Envy from the *De Planctu Naturae*, translated by Moffatt, Yale Studies, XXXVI, N. Y., 1908, pp. 71 ff.:

Now from Pride is born a daughter . . . She is Envy, and by the gnawing rust of continual detraction she destroys the minds of men. She is the worm because of whose bite health of mind sickens and falls into disease, soundness of mind rots into decay, rest of mind is abandoned for trouble. She is the guest who, after being lodged in her host's guest-chamber, pulls down the hospitable shelter. Etc.

For the Latin see Migne's *Patr. Lat.*, CCX, 468. Cf. the portrayal of Nature, Moffatt, pp. 5 ff. This same confusion is found in the Characters in Deguileville's *Pilgrimage of the Life of Man.* See the edition of Furnivall, *EETS. ES.* LXXXIII, Envy, pp. 400 ff., ll. 14821; Treason, pp. 404, ll. 14981 ff., etc. Some of the best Characters are those of Glotonye, pp. 348, ll. 12815 ff.; and Flattery, pp. 395, ll. 14645 ff. For the French see *Le Pelerinage de Vie Humaine*, ed. Stürzinger, Roxburghe Club, London, 1893, Flattery, ll. 8105; Gluttony, ll. 10320, etc. Or see the *Romant des Trois Pelerinaiges*, Paris, c. 1500, Glotonye, ff. XLIIIJ vo. (corrected from LIIIJ); *Flaterie*, f. LIJ ro. etc. For the symbol, see *Le Testament de Jean de Meung, R. de la Rose*, ed. Méon, Paris, 1814, IV, 90 (luxury).

And she was clad ful povrely,
Al in an old torn courtepy,
As she were al with dogges torn. Etc.[17]

Of the picture of Envy we read that she:

Never lough
Nor never wel in herte ferde
But-if she outher saugh or herde
Som greet mischaunce, or greet disese.
No-thing may so moch hir plese
As mischef and misaventure;
Or whan she seeth discomfiture
Upon any worthy man falle,
Than lyketh hir ful wel withalle.

She had a strange way of looking—she looked across, or squinted; she never looked anyone straight in the face, but shut one eye for disdain, etc., etc.[18] We may compare the corresponding figure in *Piers Plowman*. Here Envy:

As pale as a pelet. in a palesye he semede,
I-clothed in a caurimauri. I couthe him not discreue;
A kertil and a courtepy. a knyf be his syde;
Ichaue a neih3ebor me neih. I haue anuy3ed him ofte,
Ablamed him be-hynde his bak. to bringe him in disclaundre,
And peired him bi my pouwer. i-punissched him ful ofte,
Bi-lowen him to lordes. to make him leose seluer,
I-don his frendes ben his fon. with my false tonge;
His grase and his good hap. greueth me ful sore.
. . . . . .
Whon I mette him in the market. that I most hate,
Ich heilede him as hendely. as I his frend weore. Etc.[19]

Still more striking than this, in the same poem, is the Character of Religion:—

Ac now is Religioun a ryder. a rowmer bi stretes,
A leder of louedayes. and a lond-bugger,
A priker on a palfray. fro manere to manere,
An heep of houndes at his ers. as he a lord were.

---

[17] Skeat, *Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, I, Oxford, 1899, p. 102, ll. 207 ff.

[18] *Ibid.*, I, pp. 103 ff., ll. 248 ff. Here also are Hatred, ll. 147 ff.; Villainy, ll. 166 ff.; Covetousness, ll. 181 ff.; Sorrow, ll. 301 ff.; etc. The French is quoted at the foot of each page.

[19] Ed. Skeat, Oxford, 1886, I, pp. 134 ff., A v. 61-79, 82-3; cf. B. v. 76 ff.

And but if his knaue knele. that shal his cuppe brynge,
He loureth on hym and axeth hym. who tauȝte hym curteisye? [20]

In the instances cited there is sometimes a dramatic quality, sometimes a bit of quoted speech. It is only necessary to set them going with personal names and freer action in order to have something like the human comedy of the Canterbury Tales. In their revelation of contemporary life they show the frank self-criticism of the period. I shall quote one more example, this time at length, to show how close these Characters are to the types which serve the purposes of fiction. This is from Gower's *Confessio Amantis*:—

The proude vice of veine gloire
Remembreth noght of purgatoire,
Hise worldes joyes ben so grete,
Him thenkth of hevene no beyete;
This lives Pompe is al his pes:
Yit schal he deie natheles,
And thereof thenkth he bot a lite,
For al his lust is to delite
In newe thinges, proude and veine,
Als ferforth as he mai atteigne.
I trowe, if that he myhte make
His body newe, he wolde take
A newe forme and leve his olde:
For what thing that he mai beholde,
The which to comun us is strange,
Anon his olde guise change
He wole and falle therupon,
Lich unto the Camelion,
Which upon every sondri hewe
That he beholt he mosťe newe
His colour, and thus unavised
Fulofte time he stant desguised.
Mor jolif than the brid in Maii
He makth him evere freissh and gay,
And doth al his array desguise,
So that of him the newe guise
Of lusty folk alle othre take.
And ek he can carolles make,
Rondeal, balade, and virelai.
And with all this, if that he may

[20] *Ibid.*, pp. 308, B x. 306 ff. Here too are Avarice, B v. 188 ff.; Wrath, C vii. 103 ff.; Lechery, C vii. 170 ff.; etc.

Of love gete him avantage,
Anon he wext of his corage
So overglad, that of his ende
He thenkth ther is no deth comende:
For he hath thanne at alle tide
Of love such a maner pride,
Him thenkth his joie is endeles.[21]

There is a suggestion of Chaucer's Squire in the latter part of this description. Gower sets forth at great length many other figures: Hypocrisy, Inobedience, Surquedrie, Avauntaunce, Cheste, Detraction, etc.,[22] and all of them rich in vivid detail.

Here is the material for an unexpected chapter in the history of fiction. In the sixteenth century, realistic satire developed to the point where it could be moulded into the Characters of Hall, Overbury, Earle, and others, of the century following. Hall's first sequence, it is interesting to remember, was his *Vices and Virtues.* When such figures were combined with drama in the pages of the *Spectator,* a long step was taken in the advance toward the modern novel. There were other contributions, to be sure, such as that of Defoe's journalistic genius for a "story." But the great run of romance hitherto had shown an extravagant need for the precise news of real life which the Character offered. All this is well known; what is not so well known is the interesting parallel which is found in Medieval conditions. It can be carried into detail: the early satires show a leaning toward realism; the treatises

[21] *Complete Works,* ed. Macaulay, II, Oxford, 1901, *the English Works,* pp. 108 ff., lib. I, ll. 2681 ff.

[22] See Hypocrisy, *ibid.,* pp. 52 ff., lib. I, ll. 594 ff.; Inobedience, pp. 69 ff., lib. I, 1235 ff.; etc. For as much material again, see the *Mirour de l'Omme, Complete Works,* I, Oxford, 1899, pp. 15 ff., ll. 1069 ff. The Confession *motif* with numerous Characters is found in the *Cursor Mundi,* ed. Morris, *EETS.,* LVII, LIX, LXII, ll. 28076 ff. (pride); 28156 ff. (envy); etc. It is also used in *Piers Plowman* in a similar way, ed. Skeat, I, pp. 130 ff., B v. 63 ff.; C vii. 14 ff. The use of a dramatic quality in representing the Sins, which appears in Deguileville and in *Piers Plowman,* is found also in an early form in the *Middle English Treatise on the Ten Commandments,* [N. Car.] *Studies in Philol.,* VI, 1910, p. 22:—

Therwith cometh in pride & settith him in þe middel of alle. and þan he beginneth to boste & ruson him self of many þinges þat he hath not. ne kowde. & alle saien it is sooth.

Then couetise herith þat. & þan cometh he in boldely. Etc.

create Characters, and these are carried further in the allegories; Chaucer uses the Characters dramatically. Chaucer's pilgrims meet at the Inn, corresponding to "the Club" which meets at the Coffee House; both groups are described in detail at the beginning; they all move about, converse, and appear in action; they all represent varied classes of the people.

Chaucer's pilgrims are nearly always more individual than the Characters, but that is true also of the Club. Most of them, however, show that element of the typical which is essential to a "broad appeal."[23] The Knight has been to all places where it is necessary that a typical knight should go; the Franklin is the typical Epicurean, and the Monk is your perfect hunting parson of a later age. The man of the fourteenth century would have recognized many an old friend here, with, however, just the proper touch—a peire of bedes, a garment, or a feature—to combine the individual with the typical. A high watermark in the expression of both at the same time is found in such a passage as that describing the Friar:—

> For thogh a widwe hadde noght a sho
> So plesaunt was his 'In principio,'
> Yet wolde he have a ferthing er he wente. A 253-255.

That the typical quality is not obscured in these portraits is shown by the fact that the pilgrims have been thought to embody the seven deadly sins. Such criticism has, in this way at least, a grain of truth. I feel confident, nevertheless, that the members of "the Club" could be analyzed in the same way.

But this parallel must not be worked too hard. For his own part Chaucer may have drawn on the literature of France and Italy for precise suggestions as to his technique. He may even have utilized hints received from the satires of Juvenal and Horace to an even greater degree than we now have any reason to suppose. Yet the tradition that I have outlined remains a likely course, broadening as it did in the many allegories of the Court of Love, which Chaucer knew so well. Through the treatises and the allegories, perhaps, art in general obtained one more "contact with

[23] See Meyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 6 ff.; 32 ff.

life," and here again, as so often happens to be the case, art became indebted to morality.[24]

HOWARD R. PATCH.

Smith College.

---

[24] The origin and development of the discourses on vice and virtue may not be discussed in a note like this. It is impossible here to do more than suggest the extent of the material, which was obviously considerable. But it is safe to say that the beginnings were ancient. On Envy, for example, we find in the sermons ascribed to St. Ambrose such an account as the following:

De invidia quoque odium, susurratio, detractio, exsultatio in adversis proximi, afflictio autem in prosperis ejus propagatur. . . . Qui itaque invidet vel odit, non alium priusquam se ipsum occidit: qui susurrat et detrahit, prius suas quam aliorum radices evellit: qui exsultat in adversis proximi, et affligitur in prosperis ejus, alieno se primum gladio petit. Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, XVII, col. 756. Cf. col. 757:—

. . . . Charitas scilicet quae fundamentum est omnium virtutum et bonorum: quae non invidet, sed congaudet: non odit, sed diligit: non susurrat, sed objurgat, non detrahit, sed arguit: non de adversis proximi gaudet, sed mœrit, etc. Note the other sins discussed here as well. Cf. St. Jerome, Migne, XXVI, col. 417:

Invidia vero aliena felicitate torquetur, et in duplicem scinditur passionem: cum aut ipse est aliquid in eo, in quo alium esse non vult: aut alium esse videns meliorem, dolet se ei non esse consimilem. Etc. Cf. St. Augustine, Migne, XXXIX, 1769. St. Augustine gives the Character of an envious man as follows:—

Attendite quod ille invidus est, qui alienum bonum suum facit: et dum facere non potest, clamat per vicos et plateas, et velut canis latrat et ardet; sed primo se ipsum, more phoenicis, occidit. Etc. Migne, XL, 1264. For other treatments of the subject, see St. Petrus Chrysologus, Migne, LII, 194 ff.; Hugo de St. Victor, *ibid.*, CLXXVI, 1000; and on "cupidus" Innocent III, *De Contemptu Mundi*, *ibid.*, CCXVII, 717 ff. In the last of these, note the Character material in col. 719: ".Quis unquam cupidus primo fuit voto contentus," etc. Hugo de St. Victor gives the family trees of the vices and virtues, Migne, CLXXVI, after col. 1006; cf. Frère Lorens and the *Ayenbite.*

NEW LIGHT ON RENAN

The most intelligent man of the nineteenth century (accepting Faguet's estimate) a prey to misgivings lest he be unequal to an examination for *la licence,* this is one of the intimate, and piquant, glimpses of Renan offered in the recently published addition to his Correspondence.[1] Similarly we find him letting himself be exploited by his employer at the boarding-school because he is too shy to call the latter a rascal (p. 16); and he writes to his sister of his lack of physical courage: "Tu connais mon caractère: quand il s'agit de lutter contre une force brute, je suis d'une prudence qui approche de la timidité" (p. 142).

There had been previous evidence of this tendency, and it constituted a serious blemish, in the opinion of one of the prominent Renan critics, Maurice Barrès (that is to say in the revised opinion of Barrès, who himself had earlier been known as Mademoiselle Renan). In 1914, on the occasion of the death of Ernest Psichari, the author of *le Roman de l'Energie Nationale* remarked upon the lack of heroism in the work of Renan: "J'y cherchais vainement un élan tout direct et tout franc, le goût du risque physique, et j'écartais avec impatience un excès de précaution. Or voici que cet enfant guerrier est apparu pour justifier son grand-père."[2] With due respect for the sacrifice of the grandson, such purification is unnecessary. The present letters prove it. Renan was anything but physically agressive, and nothing in his upbringing under the eyes of his mother and his sister[3] and in the cloister of a catholic seminary was calculated to offset his native gentleness. But he had a moral fibre which enabled him in a crisis completely to dominate his physical reticence, as is shown here at the point where he determines to rescue his sister from the dangers of the Poland of 1848: "Il est vrai que par ma mine et mon inexpérience je puis à peine m'appeler un homme. Mais je suis ton frère, cela me donnera de la force."[4] And in general such timidity as

[1] *Nouvelles Lettres Intimes, 1846-1850,* Paris, Calmann-Lévy, 1923, p. 9.

[2] *L'Ame Française et la Guerre,* II, *les Saints de la France,* Paris, 1915. pp. 71-72.

[3] Cf. Henriette's warning about the perils of railway travel, p. 508.

[4] P. 147. Cf. the energy of "je pars, sans plus rien attendre," p. 155.

he had was the defect of a virtue, a consequence of his intelligence; unlike men of a more downright and trenchant nature (and more *simplistes*) he was so sensitive to the limits of human understanding, so aware of the dimensions of the universe, that he was temperamentally disposed to personal humility.

This was a part of the critical poise admirably illustrated in these letters. How vigorously he objects to rigid systems, to a Manichean doctrine which crudely cleaves between the good and the bad, to fixed ideas that are bound to become false ideas![5] One of the most intimate and intense of the letters is that in which Renan writes of a rare but violent disagreement with his sister on the subject of liberalism, and remarks:

> Henriette, il te manque une certaine impartialité, une certaine largeur, ou tolérance, qui fait à toute chose sa part, qui ne s'attache à rien exclusivement, qui n'est d'aucun parti (tu es d'un parti, toi), mais qui voit dans chacune une face de vérité à côté d'une part d'erreur, qui n'a pour personne ni exclusion ni haine, parce qu'elle voit la nécessité de tous ces mouvements divers, et le droit qu'a chacun d'eux par la part de vérité qu'il possède, de faire son apparition dans le monde (p. 294).

The result of this non-partisanship is not oscillation. It will be remembered that during this period Renan began the composition of *l'Avenir de la Science,* published a half-century later with the prefatory statement that he found his youthful convictions essentially unchanged. The letters contain innumerable significant references to that work,[6] and they breathe the determination which is to characterize all of Renan's intellectual life, and the robust faith in his own vision of scholarship. "Mentir à ma pensée et taire des résultats fins, nouveaux, intéressants, pour répéter d'insupportables vieilleries me sera toujours impossible . . . " (p. 62). "Il faut marcher, marcher à tout prix, sans regarder ce qu'on brise, et ce qu'on renverse." (Pp. 307 ff.) This is not ruthlessness; it is the resolution of a proud spirit who begins by conquering himself, who completes his Hebrew Grammar in a dreary room, his fingers almost too chilled to write, heartened only by Berthelot,

[5] Pp. 66-68, 193-194, 279, 291.

[6] The first mention of *l'Avenir de la Science,* is in the letter of May 9, 1848 (p. 176). One of the most curious references is that in a letter of August, 1849, where he voices the fear lest if the publication of the book is postponed for a year it may no longer correspond to his views (p. 355).

and who finds the ultimate satisfaction chiefly in having exercised his moral powers, in having made himself terminate a difficult task, *malgré tout, malgré moi-même* (p. 82).

Back of this lies a deep seriousness. Sainte-Beuve found something sacerdotal in Renan; there is much evidence on this point here and of such a nature as to give pause to those who like Henri Massis[7] and Barrès[8] cry dilettante. Witness his objection to the mere curiosity of certain critics and of the middle class that did not understand the cosmic significance of scholarship. What is M. Cousin in the last analysis but a *curieux de philosophie,* M. Villemain but a *curieux de littérature?* These man have a delicate discernment not likely to be equalled, but deep convictions are lacking. "Ce sont des surfaces qui se superposent, en se reflétant la lumière par mille jeux divers et agréables. Percez au-delà, vous trouverez le vide du scepticisme" (p. 221). Compare his strictures, no doubt severe, concerning Naples and southern Italy, the country of pleasure, nothing else. "Jamais une noble pensée n'a germé sur ce sol; jamais on ne s'est préoccupé du beau idéal et du vrai. . . Pays ignoble, pays de plaisir; la jouissance étouffe l'art, comme elle étouffe la beauté morale. Pourquoi ces rudes efforts, cette poursuite acharnée? *cogliamo la rosa,* c'est bien plus facile. . . . Ce n'est pas là ma manière; ce pays excite en moi une grande réaction morale. . . " (pp. 406 f.). This is remote from Anatole France's "quand la route est fleurie ne demandez pas où elle mène." Renan's attitude found in letters written in his twenties proves nothing directly concerning the mood of his full maturity, but it shows impressively what is the fundamental nature of the man, and it is in complete consonance with the tone—how sacerdotal!—of the 1890 preface of *l'Avenir de la Science.*

The earlier collection of letters to Henriette, it has been contended (by Barrès again), lacked a certain deep piety, contained no marks of Renan's having experienced, when facing the issue of allegiance to the Church, *une angoisse religieuse.* "Ce n'est nullement une crise religieuse qu'il traversait dans les années 1843, 44 et 45. Ce sont des inquiétudes de vocation et, pour parler net, de

[7] Cf. *la Revue Universelle,* 1er mars, 15 fév., 1er avril 1923, on the "universal concupiscence" of Renan.

[8] Cf. his *Discours* at the Renan Centennial, in *le Temps,* 1er mars 1923.

carrière."[9] A problem in domestic economy! (*Id.*, p. 52). No mystic accent![10]

This is savage criticism, but it is not intended for the moment to attempt an exact appraisal of it; our subject is the content of the new letters.

They show beyond question that Renan was eager about his career; he dwells upon *mon avenir*, he proposes to have the right people interested, to make the necessary acquaintances; the tone at these points is not sordid but somewhat unexpectedly sophisticated (pp. 37, 69, 115, 366). Shall we raise a deprecatory hand and say that this was merely the prudence (allied to personal humility, to timidity) of a discriminating spirit? This is a part of it. There is also undoubtedly a problem in domestic economy here, inevitable in the case of an impecunious and high-minded youth who feels he has too long been a financial burden to his family, notably to his self-sacrificing sister.

Is there then no mystic accent in these new letters? Not if, with Barrès, we identify such a quantity with an orthodox catholicism. There is no sign of any yearning for the renounced doctrine, no suggestion of nostalgia, and once we see, as Barrès maintains, that Renan was inclined to think of his *crise de conscience* principally in terms of the effect upon his mother (p. 109). It is obvious that Renan was serenely detached from orthodoxy. Yet he remains an intensely religious man. Why, he cries, does not modern philosophy recognize the eternal law that humanity is religious! (p. 382). He pledges allegiance to the believers.[11] The most striking and significant passage is that in which he voices his sympathy with the spiritual aspirations of the Italian monks met at Monte Cassino:

Quel types admirables de résignation douce, de délicatesse morale, de culture intellectuelle, j'ai rencontrés sous ces capuchons de

[9] Barrès, *Taine et Renan, pages perdues*, Paris, 1922, p. 51.

[10] *Id.*, p. 53. How different, says Lemaître, in a similar connection, from Jouffroy, Lamennais, Pascal! Cf. *les Contemporains*, I, 203: "Cet homme . . . a passé par la plus terrible crise morale qu'une âme puisse traverser. Il a dû, à vingt ans, et dans des conditions qui rendaient le choix particulièrement douloureux et dramatique, opter entre la foi et la science, rompre les liens les plus forts et les plus doux. . . Et il est gai!"

[11] P. 335. Repeated in *l'Avenir de la Science*.

moines! . . . Ah! que nous étions faits pour nous comprendre! J'ai retrouvé là toutes mes années d'autrefois, mes doutes, mes combats, mes hésitations.[12] J'ai fait ce que je devais faire étant Français; et je crois qu'ils font ce qu'ils doivent faire étant Italiens. . . . ils me lisent et m'apprennent à admirer les *Inni* de Manzoni, admirables expressions de ce *christianisme moral,* auquel se rattachent toutes les intelligences élevées de l'Italie contemporaine, et auquel pour ma part je me rallierais si volontiers à condition qu'on me laissât carte blanche pour la critique dogmatique et historique (p. 417).

Perhaps, as Barrès says, Renan never was a Catholic. But, without trespassing upon doctrine, one may affirm that Renan possessed and retained—and with a genuine *accent mystique*—his spiritual fervor.

It required character to do so in the midst of the personal and public crises which Renan traversed in the difficult years from 1846 to 1850. He is found here holding steadily to *la religion nouvelle* (p. 196). He accepts gallantly the conditions of his own temperament, he practices the intellectual hospitality which was with him inborn, he scrutinizes all testimony, without cynicism but with a fearlessly critical eye. Not a wielder of the big stick,[13] he nevertheless uses the weapons that are germane to him,[14] and in a cause to which he can heartily ally himself we find him sufficiently militant. Notice the zest with which he thrusts at the Minister of Public Instruction, de Falloux (p. 303). When it becomes a question of upholding the gospel of discrimination—for him a spiritual issue—Renan is admirably courageous.

For any student of Renan this new volume of correspondence becomes indispensable, whether the interest be in such issues as have been mentioned or in the intimate details of Renan's daily living or in his relations with Henriette or in the influence of his journey to Italy or in the development of his political philosophy out of the 1848 experiences. For the reader who peruses these letters without bias certain of the charges which have been brought

[12] Here are the marks of a genuinely spiritual crisis.

[13] P. 222. "Celui qui est habile dans l'escrime ne va pas rechercher une lutte à coups de bâtons."

[14] P. 142. "Chacun ne cherche à lutter que par le côté où il se sent fort."

against Renan will fade away, and the great critic will emerge a figure more than ever impressive.[15]

HORATIO E. SMITH.

Amherst College.

THE EARLY VERSION OF THE *COMÉDIE DES ACADÉMISTES*.

Notwithstanding the fact that A. Fabre in 1890 and E. Dannheisser in 1892 pointed out that Chapelain's correspondence furnishes proof that the *Comédie des Académistes* was circulated in manuscript as early as April, 1638,[1] recent works on Saint-Evremond [2] still repeat Des Maiseaux's statement "qu'elle fut faite au

[15] The text of the letters, according to the *Avertissement*, is scrupulously exact, and cut—very rarely—only for family reasons. Fragments of eight of the letters had already been published—singularly enough—in English in the *North American Review* (April 19, 1907), altho the *Avertissement* makes no mention of this. This offers a certain opportunity for verification, and there prove to be several discrepancies. A marginal note published in *NAR* as part of a letter dated March, 1847, occurs in the French text in a letter of August 4, 1847. The second letter of the *NAR* series is absent from the French text, altho it contains details no more intimate than many published. Letter IV in *NAR*, dated March, 1846, is likewise missing from the French text, yet it is important and not unduly personal (cf. p. 24 of the French text where there is evidently a reference to what had previously been said in the letter in question). Such variants are, from the point of view of "la plus scrupuleuse exactitude," disconcerting. Annotations in this edition are few; one of them is a careless and insufficient reference to *l'Avenir de la Science* (Renan's *Table* referred to on p. 346 is, as the editor must know, inaccurate; it does not always correspond with the text, and the passage reproduced in this letter by Renan occurs, with omissions and variations, not in Chapter IV but in Chapter XVII, pp. 358-362).

Nevertheless the collection is invaluable and should be gratefully received. It is now planned (Cf. *Revue Critique*, 1924, p. 39) to publish whatever letters may prove available of those sent by Renan to his friends among writers and scholars. In the interest of a definitive evaluation of the great critic it is to be hoped that the appeal for such material (from Mme Noémi Renan, 16, rue Chaptal, Paris) may be fruitful.

[1] A. Fabre, *Chapelain et nos deux premières Académies*, pp. 168-172. E. Dannheisser, *Zur Geschichte der Einheiten in Fr.*, *ZFSL*, 1892, p. 69.

[2] Cf. Remy de Gourmont's *Notice* to the volume of selections from Saint-

commencement de l'année 1643." [3] Des Maiseaux invoked for this date Saint Evremond's own testimony, but it must be observed that at the end of his life, when it was given, Saint-Evremond had long since forgotten the exact date at which the satire was composed. He made to other contemporaries divergent statements about the play, in conflict especially with the date 1643 which he mentioned to his biographer Des Maiseaux.

In a letter to La Monnoye of August 1698, Bayle states: "J'ai fait consulter M. de Saint-Evremond touchant la *Comédie des Académistes,* dont j'ai un exemplaire depuis longtemps; il a répondu qu'il fit cette pièce étant au collège." [4] Now as Saint-Evremond was born in 1614, and left college in 1630 to join the army, he would have written his satire on the French Academy several years before its foundation! Three months later, Dec. 16, 1698, Bayle gives further information: "Il faut, Monsieur, que je vous fasse part d'une réponse plus précise que M. de Saint-Evremond a faite à la question que je lui avois fait proposer (whether or not he was the author of the *Comédie des Académistes*): deux personnes m'ont fait savoir ce qu'il a répondu. La première se contente de m'écrire qu'il se reconnoissoit l'auteur de la *Comédie;* la seconde a usé de distinction Voici ses termes: Monsieur de Saint-Evremond a répondu qu'il est vrai qu'au sortir du collège il avoit travaillé à la pièce intitulée *Les Académistes;* qu'il n'y avoit pas travaillé seul; que le comte d'Etlan, dont parle le *Chevroeana,* y avoit eu plus de part que lui; [5] que d'autres encore y avoient contribué; que la comédie étoit fort mauvaise, mais qu'il y a 18 ou 20 ans, on la lui renvoya; qu'il *la retoucha et la refit.*" [6] Saint-Evremond, then, assigns to the second reworked version of

Evremond in the *Collection des plus belles pages,* 1909, p. 202. Ernst Mollenhauer in *Saint-Evremond als Kritiker,* 1914, p. 55, gives the date as 1642 without indicating his authority.

[3] *Les véritables Oeuvres de M. de Saint-Evremond,* 1705, I, 3. E. Dannheisser, *op. cit.,* p. 69, states that Chapelain's letters prove that the *Comédie des Académistes* was played in 1638. But they only prove that it was circulated in manuscript. Chapelain says: "Le peuple . . . s'entretient d'une mauvaise comédie *manuscrite.* . . ."

[4] *Oeuvres de Bayle,* IV, 770.

[5] Chevreau states in the *Chevroeana* that the Count d'Etlan was the real author of the *Comédie des Académistes.*

[6] *Oeuvres de Bayle,* IV, 779.

the *Comédie des Académistes*—the one found in his works—the date of 1678, or 1680. To Des Maiseaux he mentioned the latter solely: "Il m'apprit qu'en 1680 Mme la Duchesse de Mazarin souhaita de voir cette pièce, telle qu'il l'avoit écrite; et que son manuscrit s'étant perdu en France, il se trouva obligé de retoucher l'imprimé, ou plutôt de le refondre; mais qu'il ne savoit pas ce que cela étoit devenu. J'eus le bonheur de déterrer cet ouvrage chez la veuve d'un copiste de Mme de Mazarin." [7]

With the help of these utterances, the history of the play can be outlined as follows: In 1638, Saint-Evremond, the Count d'Etlan,[8] and others composed the *Comédie des Académistes,* which circulated in manuscript and aroused Chapelain's and Boisrobert's ire.[9] It appeared in 1650, with a preface signed Des Cavenetz.[10] Saint-Evremond was banished to England in 1661 and, about nineteen years later—"son manuscrit s'étant perdu en France"—he rewrote and transformed the play. For this revision he made use of the printed text of 1650, though he repudiated it as full of mistakes. It is obvious enough that Saint-Evremond, who had not seen the early version of his manuscript for at least nineteen years, could not be trusted, in 1680, to remember exactly which verses occurred in the primitive form of the play. Moreover, forty-two years had elapsed since its composition and the fact that he did not even recall exactly at what period of his life he committed this youthful indiscretion, shows that it had occupied but little space in his memory. He did not attach much importance even to his revised version and, with characteristic negligence, lost again the manuscript of his second text! From all this it results

[7] Cited by Giraud, *Notice sur Saint-Evremond*, in *Oeuvres Mêlées*, p. liii. Des Maiseaux repeats this statement in almost identical terms in his *Vie de M. de Saint-Evremond*, p. viii of the revised edition of 1709.

[8] The count d'Etlan or d'Estelan de Saint Luc, abbé de Chartrice, was the son of the Maréchal de Saint Luc. To him has been attributed a satirical poem, *Le Gouvernement présent ou Eloge de son Eminence ou la Milliade* (also ascribed to Ch. Beys and to Favereau). Tallemant des Réaux states that he wrote satires. *Hist.*, IV, 247. See T. Lebreton, *Biographie Normande; Biographie Univ.;* Moréri, *Dict.*, etc.

[9] *Corr. de Chapelain;* Tall. des Réaux, *Hist.*, II, 414.

[10] Quérard, *Sup. Litt. dévoilées*, I, 909, is the only bibliographer who refers to an edition of 1646, of which, however, no copy has been found, and which was unknown to Saint Evremond himself.

that Saint-Evremond's statements about the *Comédie des Académistes* must be, if possible, carefully tested by other evidence.

In print two different texts of the *Comédie des Académistes* are available, and neither of the two can be said to represent the original version:

A)—The text of the edition of 1650, in five acts. This text has been reprinted by Livet in his edition of Pelisson and d'Olivet's *Histoire de l'Académie Française,* vol. 1. According to Des Maiseaux, "quand elle fut imprimée en 1650, M. de Saint Evremond ne la reconnoissoit plus" and "M. de Saint-Evremond désavouoit cet imprimé." [11]

B)—The rewritten text of 1680, in three acts, again revised about 1705, when Des Maiseaux prepared his edition of the works of de Saint-Evremond.[12]

No attention seems to have been paid to the manuscripts of the play still in existence. Since they were passed on from hand to hand, "sous le manteau," for twelve years at least, it is not astonishing to find that they are rather numerous. Among them the *Ms. F. F. 20038* of the Bibliothèque Nationale deserves special attention since it bears the date of 1638, the very year that, according to Chapelain's letters, the satire was first known to the public. Since this MS. dates from the year of origin of the play, it must constitute its earliest version, or, at all events, a text far nearer to the original draft than either the disavowed edition of 1650 or the modified text of 1680.

Its title, different from that of the printed versions, reads: *Comédie où l'Académie françoise est représentée faisant ses fonctions sur la réformation de la langue. De l'invention de Q. C. D. R. 1638.* Its sarcastic *Dédicace* is signed *Un Tel,* instead of *Des Cavenetz,* as in the edition of 1650. I print it here, because of its historical interest and its bearing upon the prestige of the French Academy in the early years of its existence.[13]

[11] *Vie de M. de Saint-Evr.,* p. vii.

[12] He states: "Il la revit avec moi et c'est sur la copie que j'en fis que nous l'avons imprimée à la tête de ses ouvrages," *op. cit.,* p. vii.

[13] Livet, *op. cit.,* has not reprinted the *Dédicace* of the extremely rare edition of 1650.

Aux Autheurs de l'Académie qui se meslent de réformer la langue, excepté Gomberville.

Messieurs,

Il est très juste de vous dédier cet ouvrage puisque vous en avez fourni le sujet et qu'il n'y a point de gens au monde qui méritent ce petit honneur si bien que vous. Ne vous laissez pas gaigner aux excessives louanges que je vous donne, car, étant généreux comme je suis, il me fasche de corrompre l'intégrité de mes juges et d'obtenir par complaisance une approbation que je n'aurais pas méritée. J'ay cru d'abord, vous voyant tellement engagés, que vous seriez prévenus de passion et sur cette fantaisie, qui m'a trompé quelque temps, j'ay consulté des autheurs dont le jugement doit estre d'autant plus sain qu'il est plus désinteressé que le vostre. Quand j'ay considéré leurs ouvrages, j'y ay trouvé de beaux sentimens et, à dire vray, j'eusse consenti qu'on leur eust donné la réputation qu'ils ont cherchée; mais sitost que j'ay comparé ces Messieurs avec vous, j'ay cogneu la foiblesse de leurs sens par la force de vostre raisonnement et me suis estonné mille fois qu'on trouvast des bestes et des anges parmy les hommes. Quelques intéressés que vous puissiez être, j'advoue que vous estes seuls capables de bien juger; comme vous avez l'esprit excellent, vous avez l'âme parfaitement belle et qui considérera que vous passez les années toutes entières à la réformation d'un mot, se persuadera très aisément que vous employez toute vostre vie à combattre les mauvaises inclinations qui nous perdent. Je ne m'estonne point si vostre esprit ne trouve rien qui lui empesche la liberté de ses fonctions. Vous estes si sobres qu'il ne s'eslève aucune vapeur au cerveau et si chastes que vous conservez tous vos esprits pour la continuelle méditation où vous vivez. Aussi n'est-ce pas merveille que vous soyez excellents prophètes puisqu'outre la bonté du tempérament, vous avez encore les deux qualités que Balzac a tant désirées pour la prophétie. Mais servez vous des divinations aux affaires que vous savez si heureusement prédire. De moy, je ne veux que la censure ou l'approbation du petit ouvrage que je vous offre. Je n'ay point voulu consulter les morts ny tirer des règles qu'ils nous ont laissées les satisfactions que j'attens. Je ne trouve point aussi d'autheurs à présent, excepté vous, que je veuille croire, car de suivre le génie de Théophile, imiter les descriptions de St. Amand, chercher l'art de Malherbe ou l'esgalité de Racan, c'est une chose à mon advis très indigne d'un honnête homme, puisque vous effacez par les louanges que vous méritez toute la gloire que ces Messieurs là vous ont acquise. Mais pour ne plus parler couvertement, je suis de vos sottises et de vos laschetés,

le grand ennemy,

UN TEL.

Besides the *Dédicace,* the principal difference between the MS. of 1638 and the edition of 1650 consists in the addition of two strophes to the song which Saint Amant is supposed to sing:

C'est en ce temps que les douleurs
  Triomphent de nostre foiblesse;
C'est en ce temps que tout nous blesse
  Et nous n'avons rien que des pleurs.
Mais sitost que les ans nous permettent l'usage
  De ce nectar si doux,
On peut emplir la couppe et voir fuir à la nage
  Les plaisirs et courroux.

On boit bien chez le grand Pluton,
  On s'enyvre chez Hypocrate,
  On meurt buvant comme Socrate,
  On boit de nuit comme Caton.
On pourra, triompher ainsi comme Alexandre
  Avec l'ayde des pots!
Si nous aimons le vin nous en peut-on reprendre
  Que fort mal à propos?

There are, furthermore, about forty minor variants, ranging from a single word to almost a full line between the MS. of 1638 and the printed text of 1650, so that, on the whole, both versions are remarkably similar.

The conclusion is unavoidable that Saint-Evremond, when he discarded the 1650 edition, was not solely spurred on by the mistakes it contains, but rather by his desire to improve the play. That such was his object can be clearly seen from the fact that he reduced it from five acts to three, suppressed the ironical *Dédicace* and bolstered up some of the weaker passages by a number of new lines.

GUSTAVE L. VAN ROOSBROECK.

New York University.

HIATUSERSCHEINUNGEN IM ALTISLÄNDISCHEN

I

Bei den Zahlwörtern níu *'neun'* *und* tíu *'zehn'*

Der Hiatus *î* + *u* bei den Zahlwörtern *níu* und *tíu* bleibt noch immer unerklärt. In den aisl. Grammatiken werden *níu* und *tíu* nur als unregelmässige Formen erwähnt, ohne dass irgend ein Versuch gemacht wird, dieselben zu erklären (vgl. z. B. Noreen[3], § 127[b], b, 2, Heusler[2], § 97, 4b).

Ich masse es mir nicht an, eine endgültige und beweiskräftige

Erklärung dieser unregelmässigen Formen vorbringen zu können. Bei der schwierigen Natur des Problems darf ich nur hoffen, dass der folgende Erklärungsversuch eine ernste Berücksichtigung verdient.

Wir sehen, dass bei den Formen *níu*(<**niu*(*n*) = got. *niun*) und *tíu*(<**tihu*(*n*)<got. *taíhun*) die Vokale *í* + *u* sich der regelrechten Verschmelzung zu *jú* entzogen haben. Es liesse sich der Grund zu diesem Unterbleiben der Vokalschmelzung vielleicht dadurch erklären, dass das *-u* hier als die Pluralendung *-u* des Nom.-Akk. neutr. der nominalen *a*-Flexion empfunden und somit die unflektierbaren Formen *níu* und *tíu* als erstarrte Pluralformen angesehen wurden.

Dagegen ist das Zahlwort *þrjú* 'drei' Nom.-Akk. neutr. der regelrechten Entwicklung aus **þrí-u*(<got. *þrija*) unterworfen. Man soll aber beachten, dass *þrjú* Adjektiv ist und eine vollkommene Flexion besitzt, während *níu* und *tíu* von Hause aus unflektierbare Substantiva sind. Da nun im Gegensatz zu *þrjú* die Formen *níu* und *tíu* unflektierbar waren, so war der Vokal *u* als Kennzeichen des Plur. um so nötiger, als *níu* und *tíu* keine anderen Formen besassen; bei einer Verschmelzung des *î* + *u* zu *jú*(d. h. **njú* und **tjú*, gleich *þrjú*) hätte der Vokal *u*, da er hier als Stammvokal dient, nicht die Pluralform deutlich zu erkennen gegeben.

Merkwürdig ist es weiter, dass im Aisl. nicht nur die unflektierbaren Zahlwörter *níu* und *tíu*, sondern auch das unflektierbare Zahlwort *sjau* '*sieben*' dessen urnord. Form(**síu*) gleichfalls auf *-u* auslautete, unregelmässig entwickelt sind. Lautgerecht hätte uns urgerm. **siƀun*(= got. *sibun*) eine Form **sjú*(vgl. neuschw. *sju*) ergeben, gerade wie **njú*: **tjú* aus urgerm. **niun*: **tehun*; d. h. **siƀun*>**siu̯u̯-u*(vgl. Noreen[3], § 217, 3)>**síu*(vgl. Noreen[3], § 227, 2)>aisl. **sjú*; vgl. **hîu̯u̯-un*(= ahd. *hîwun*)>**hí-u*>*hjú* 'Ehegatten.'

Keine bis jetzt vorgebrachte Erklärung der aisl. Form *sjau* ist überzeugend. Ich kann mich nicht mit Falk und Torp(*Norw.-Dän. Etym. Wörterb.*, II, 1229 sub *syv*) einverstanden erklären, die in aisl. *sjau* "Brechung von *e* zu *ja*" sehen, weil meiner Ansicht nach die urnord. Grundform des Wortes nicht **sɛƀu*(*n*), sondern **sɪƀu*(*n*) gewesen sein muss; das *u* der Endsilbe erfordert

im Urnord. ein *i* der Wurzelsilbe, gleichgültig aus welchem indogerm. Vokal (vgl. lat. *septem*, gr. ἑπτά) dieses *i* entwickelt sein mag.

Ich glaube nicht, dass sich die aisl. Form *sjau* als lautgerecht aus **siƀun* erklären lässt. Ich vermute vielmehr, dass die Form *sjau* eine Umgestaltung des lautgesetzlichen **sjú* darstellt und zwar nach dem Vorbild von dem flektierten Adj. *tvau* 'zwei' Nom.-Akk. neutr.

Die Form *tvau* ist aus **tva*[1] (= got. *twa*) + *u* wohl nach dem Muster von dem Demonstrativpronomen *þau* (<**þô* + *u*, vgl. *þou* der Runeninschrift *Noleby*) entstanden. Das *u* in *tvau* ist also eigentlich die angefügte Pluralendung des Nom.-Akk. der nominalen *a*-Flexion.

Gegen die Vermutung, dass die aisl. Form *sjau* eine Umbilddungsform des lautgesetzlichen **sjú* nach dem Muster von *tvau* darstellt, ist hervorzuheben, dass die Form **sjú* auf einer Stufe mit den Formen **njú* und **tjú* steht, und demnach hätte man ebenso gut statt *sjau* eine Form **síu*, gleich *níu* und *tíu*, erwarten können. Weshalb dies nicht der Fall gewesen ist, bin ich nicht imstande zu ermitteln.

Jedenfalls aber dürfen wir die aisl. Formen *sjau*, *níu* und *tíu* nicht als lautgerecht ansehen. Da bei diesen unregelmässigen Formen ein Stammvokal + *u* (bei *sjau*[2] zum fallenden Diphthong geworden) sich vorfindet, so liegt die Vermutung nahe, dass diese Formen unter dem Einflusse von der nominalen *a*-Flexion entstanden sind, wo ein *-u* als Pluralendung dem Stamme hinzugefügt wurde (vgl. *tva-u*, *þa-u*, ebenso *sja-u*, *ní-u*, *tí-u*), was den Hiatus *î* + *u* bei *níu* und *tíu* erklären könnte. Hier ist ja auch weiter der Einfluss von *ellif-u* 'elf' und *tuttug-u* 'zwanzig,' welche beide auf den Vokal *-u* auslauteten, mit in Betracht zu nehmen. Später ist das *-u* der Endsilbe in *ní-u*, *tí-u*, *ellif-u* und *tuttug-u* zu *-o* geschwächt (vgl. *ní-o*, *tí-o*, *ellef-o*, *tottog-o*).

Schliesslich sei bemerkt, dass die Form *níu* ihren langen Vokal *î* wohl dem Einfluss von *tíu* verdankt[3], denn lautgerecht hätte urgerm. **niun* im Aisl. eine Form **niu* mit kurzem *i* ergeben.

[1] Die lautgesetzliche Form *tvá* mit gedehntem Vokal liegt auch vor (vgl. Noreen[3], 435).

[2] Dagegen sind die Formen *níu* and *tíu* zweisilbig, d. h. *ní-u*: *tí-u*.

[3] Vgl. im Ahd. neben lautgerechtem *niun* 'neun' auch die Form *niuw-an* (*Otfrid* II, 4, 3), deren Endung *-an* unter dem Einflusse von *zeh-an* 'zehn' entstanden ist.

II

Beim Optativ präs. des Verbum substantivum

Über die Lautgestalt des Opt. präs. des Verbum substantivum im Aisl. macht A. Heusler (*Aisl. Elementarb*[2]., § 336) die folgende Bemerkung: "Der *Optativ* fordert in den älteren Gedichten *zweisilbige* Formen. Setzt man sie mit Recht als *séa, séir, séi* usw. an (nicht als *sía, síir, síi*), so können sie den got. Formen nur auf einem Umweg gleichgestellt werden: urn. **sīēR, *sīē* (got. *sijais, sijai*) wurde früh zu **sēR, *sē;* hier stellte man die gewohnten Optativendungen her: **sē-iR, *sē-i* wie **bū-iR, *bū-i* zu *búa* "wohnen"; danach dann auch die 1. Sing. **sē-a* (statt **sīa*). Im 12. Jahrhundert wurden diese zweisilbigen Formen kontrahiert."

Aus Heuslers Deutungsversuch ersieht man aber nicht, auf welchem Wege ein urn. **sīēR, *sīē* zu **sēR, *sē* hätte werden können. Aus dem Ausdrucke "urn. **sīēR, *sīē* wurde früh zu **sēR, *se*" dürfte man folgern, dass er hiermit einen lautlichen Übergang von *ī* + *ē* in *ē* bezeichnen wolle. Eine solche Annahme wird aber durch die Tatsache widerlegt, dass bei der Verschmelzung zweier *gleichartiger* an einander stossender Vokale immer der *betonte* Vokal sich *zu Kosten des unbetonten* geltend macht.[4] Da nun das *-ē* der Endsilbe in urn. **sī-ēR, *sī-ē* sicher schwach betont war, so hätten wir lautgerecht im Aisl. nicht *sér, sé,* sondern **sír, *sí* (vgl. ahd. *sīs, sī*) erwarten dürfen.

Ich glaube nicht, dass ein urn. **sī-ēR, *sī-ē* usw. auf lautlichem Wege zu aisl. *sér, sé* usw. hätte werden können; wir werden wohl

[4] Vgl. Heusler, *Aisl. Elementarb.*[2], § 97, 4, b. Heusler ist (*a. a. O.*, § 96, 3) meiner Ansicht nach im Unrecht, wenn er die Entwicklungsstufen von urn. **frīandiR>frændr* als **frīandiR>*frīændR>*frjændr>frændr* bezeichnet. Da der helle Vokal *i* sonst nur vor dunklem Vokal in den Übergangslaut *i̯* (*j*) übergeht, so muss wohl das *ī* in **frīandiR* doch in *j* übergegangen sein schon vor der Zeit, da das gleich folgende *a* durch *i*-Umlaut zum hellen *æ* geworden war. Die Entwicklungsstufen sollten demnach sein: urn. **frīandiR>*frjándiR>*frjændr>frændr.*

Weiter ist **frīhelsa* wohl nicht zu **frjelsa>frelsa* geworden, wie dies Heusler (*a. a. O.*, §§ 96, 3; 141, Anm. 2) will. Da der Vokal *ī* vor (später geschwundenem *h*, ausser wenn in der folgenden Silbe ein *i̯* oder ein *u̯* zur Zeit des Überganges stand, sonst in *ē* übergegangen ist, so ist wohl **frīhelsa* zunächst nicht zu **frjelsa*, sondern zu **frē-elsa* geworden. Demnach sollten die Entwicklungsstufen sein: **frīhelsa>*frē-elsa>*frēlsa> frelsa.* Ebenso Noreen, *Aisl. Gr*[2]., § 125.

auf anderem Wege die Erklärung der Formen aisl. *sér, sé* gegenüber den got. Formen *sijais, sijai*(>urn. **sī-ēR, *sī-ē*) suchen müssen.

Wie Heusler richtig bemerkt, können die älteren aisl. Formen *séa, séir, séi* den got. Formen nur auf einem Umweg gleichgestellt werden. Da die Annahme eines lautlichen Überganges urn. **sī-ēR, *sī-ē*>**sēR, *sē* hinfällig ist, so ist dieser Umweg wohl in einer Umgestaltung der Formen urn. **sī-ēR, *sī-ē* zu **sēR, *sē* zu suchen, und zwar nach dem Vorbild des Typus **tī-h-ēR*>**tē-ēR*> **tēR; *tī-h-ē*>**tē-ē*>**te* (got. *teihw-ais, teihw-ai*), woraus aisl. *tér, té* 'du zeigest,' 'er zeige' usw. Mit dem Typus **tī-h-an* (mit langem *ī* der Stammsilbe) ist weiter der Typus **sĕ-h-an* = got. *saíhwan* (mit kurzem *ĕ* der Stammsilbe) zusammengefallen, vgl. **sĕ-h-ēR*>**sē-ēR*>**sēR; *sĕ-h-ē*>**sē-ē*>**sē,* 'du sehest,' 'er sehe,' usw.

Verba mit dem jüngeren durch Ausfall des intervokalischen *-h-* entstandenen Hiatus *ē* + *ē* lagen also in urn. Zeit häufig vor. Dagegen ist urn. **sī-ēR, *sīē* der einzige Fall, wo ein ursprünglicher Hiatus *ī* + *ē* anzusetzen ist (hier natürlich auf Grund des got. *sijais, sijai*). Weiter ist ein jüngerer Hiatus *ī* + *ē* überhaupt nicht entstanden, weil ein Stammvokal *ī* vor ursprünglichem *h* gegen ein *ē* der Endsilbe nach Ausfall des *-h-* überall zu *ē* geworden ist. Es ist also ganz gut möglich, dass die Formen des Opt. präs. des Verbum substantivum, **sī-ēR, *sī-ē,* die einen sonst nicht vorkommenden Hiatus *ī* + *ē* enthielten, in die Bahn von denjenigen (häufig vorliegenden) Verben abgelenkt worden ist, welche den Hiatus *ē* + *ē* enthielten; d. h. die Formen urn. **sī-ēR, *sī-ē* sind zu **sē-ēR, *sē-ē* (woraus **sēR, *sē*) umgestaltet worden nach dem Vorbild von dem häufig vorliegenden Typus **tē-ēR, *tē-ē; *sē-ēR, *sē-ē* (zu resp. **tīhan, *sĕhan* Inf.).

Wenn diese Annahme richtig ist, so ist urn. **sī-ēR, *sī-ē* nicht "schon früh" zu **sēR, *sē* geworden, wie dies Heusler meint, sondern die Formen urn. **sēR, *sē* sind erst jüngeren Ursprungs, d. h. Umgestaltungsformen nach der Zeit der Entstehung des jüngeren Hiatus *ē* + *ē* entwickelt. Übrigens liegt überhaupt kein Grund vor, das *ē* in aisl. *séa* (später zu *sjá* geworden) 'ich sei' für älter zu halten, als das *ē* z. B. in aisl. *téa*(>*tjá*) Opt. präs. 'ich zeige,' oder in aisl. *séa*(>*sjá*) Opt. präs. 'ich sehe.'

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT.

University of Kansas.

FURTHER NOTES ON *PAN Y TOROS*

Some years ago I discussed in this journal (XX, 145-148) the bibliography of *Pan y toros,* and an English translation of the Spanish satire. The earliest printed edition, so far as is known, was published at Madrid, by Don Santiago Fernández, 1812. In this edition the work is ascribed to Jovellanos. The satire has also been attributed to Pedro Centeno. That the work was written before 1812 is obvious enough, because it refers to conditions in Spain under Charles IV (1788-1808). An undated edition in the Ticknor Library states on the title-page that *Pan y toros* was an address made by Jovellanos in the bull-ring of Madrid about 1796 ("por los años de 1796"). Other editions date it more vaguely "en el reinado de Carlos IV."

There has been in my possession for some time a manuscript of the satire, entitled *Oración apologética en defensa del Estado floreciente de nuestra España, año de 1804.* It has numerous minor variants, like "ha conseguido evitar" for "ha evitado," "servir a la opresión a sus ciudadanos" for "servir a la opresión de sus conciudadanos," etc. This manuscript was not necessarily written in 1804, but is apparently a transcript of one bearing that date.

More interesting and important is the discovery that a few paragraphs of *Pan y toros* occur in the *Correo literario y económico de Sevilla* (I, 1803). In the issue of October 15 there appeared a *Carta de Mr. de Maupertuis, Del derecho que el hombre tiene sobre las bestias.* The caption reads as follows: "Deseando contribuir enquanto esté de nuestra parte á la diversión del Público, legitimamente congregado en la gran Plaza de Toros de esta Ciudad, en las tardes de los días 17 y 18 del presente, le ofrecemos la siguiente carta, para que se entretenga interín sale el primer Toro." After the letter, which is a plea for humane treatment of animals, there is a "P(ost) D(ata) Torera," as ironical as the caption. In the number corresponding to November 19, a subscriber signing himself "El Apologista de la Tauromanía," "Sevilla 18 de Octubre de 1803," replies to the "sátira mordaz, que baxo mil jocoserías trae la P. D. torera del Correo del 15 del pasado." The reply is written in the same ironical tone as the "P. D. Torera," and proba-

bly was the work of the same editorial writer. After two introductory sentences, the argument against bull-fights is, with a few verbal changes, the same as in *Pan y toros* (pp. 23 ff. of the Madrid, 1812, edition). Have we here brazen plagiarism of a satirical pamphlet that circulated in manuscript until Spain won freedom of the press, or is this the first draft of a portion of *Pan y toros?* Neither Centeno nor Jovellanos appears in the list of subscribers to the *Correo.* The editor of the journal was Justino Matute y Garviria, and the principal collaborators, Félix José Reinoso, Alberto Lista, José María Roldán, Tomás José González Carvajal, Francisco Núñez y Díaz, Manuel María del Mármol, José María Blanco y Crespo, Francisco de Paula López de Castro, and José Marchena.

As the *Correo literario y económico de Sevilla* is not easily accessible, the first paragraph (p. 115) of the letter to the editor is quoted here, followed by the corresponding portion of *Pan y toros* (ed. Madrid, 1812):

(1) No hé podido sufrir con paciencia la sátira mordaz, que baxo mil jocoserías trae la P. D. torera del Correo del 15 del pasado. ¿Pues que no sabe, quien así se atreve á injuriarnos públicamente á todos los aficionados, que en el anfiteatro augusto de las plazas de Toros es donde se conoce el mérito español, y se vé el buen gusto y delicadeza nacional? ¿Ignora que las fiestas de toros son los eslavones de nuestra sociedad, el pábulo de nuestro amor propio, y los talleres de nuestras costumbres políticas? Reflexione qualquiera que sea anti-torero, que estas fiestas son las que nos caracterizan, y nos hacen á los españoles singulares, entre todas las naciones de la tierra: porque abrazan quantos objetos agradables é instructivos se pueden desear, templan nuestra codicia fogosa, é ilustran nuestros delicados entendimientos, dulcifican nuestra inclinacion laboriosa, y nos preparan las acciones generosas y magníficas. Todas las artes, y ciencias concurren á perfeccionarlas, y ellas á porfia á perfeccionar las ciencias y las artes. Hasta á el baxo pueblo le proporcionan la diversion y la holgazanería, que es un bien; y le impiden el trabajo, que es un mal. . . .

(2)—No, Pueblo mio: no es mi fin el ponerte colorado, sino el demostrar que nuestra España es a un mismo tiempo niña, muchacha, jóven, vieja, y decrépita, teniendo las propiedades de cada uno de estos periodos de la vida civil: conozco tu mérito, y en éste augusto anfiteatro, donde solo celebra sus asambleas el pueblo Español, estoy viendo tu buen gusto y tu delicadeza. *Las fiestas de toros,* son los eslabones de nuestra sociedad, el pábulo de nuestro amor pátrio, y los talleres de nuestras costumbres políticas.

Estas fiestas que nos caracterizan, y nos hacen singulares entre todas las naciones de la tierra, abrazan quantos objetos agradables é instructivos se pueden desear: templan nuestra codicia fogosa: ilustran nuestros entendimientos delicados: dulcifican nuestra inclinacion á la humanidad: divierten nuestra aplicacion laboriosa, y nos preparan á las acciones generosas, y magnificas: todas las ciencias, todas las artes concurren á porfia á perfeccionarlas, y ellas á porfia perfeccionan las artes y las ciencias: ellas proporcionan hasta el bajo pueblo la diversion, y holganza, que es un bien; y le impiden el trabajo, y la tarea, que es un mal. . . .

MILTON A. BUCHANAN.

University of Toronto.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF TWO PAMPHLETS AGAINST LA MOTTE'S *INÈS DE CASTRO*

Houdart de la Motte's successful tragedy *Inès de Castro,* represented for the first time at the Théâtre français on April 6, 1723, was greeted soon after its appearance by a considerable number of critical pamphlets and parodies. Gerhard Dost in his *Houdar de la Motte als Tragiker und dramatischer Theoretiker*[1] lists several attacks against it, but does not identify the authors of many of these productions. Among the unidentified brochures are: *Le Sentiment d'un Spectateur français* and *Les Antiparadoxes.*

In a curious brochure of 1724, *Suite du Secrétaire du Parnasse,*[2] the poet and satirist François Gacon mentions the *Antiparadoxes* and *Le Sentiment d'un Spectateur français,* attributing the authorship of the former to the Abbé Desfontaines and of the latter to Thieriot. Gacon states: "—ce n'est pas à tort qu'on l'a (l'abbé Desfontaines) soupçonné d'être l'auteur des *Antiparadoxes* qu'il a, dit-on, composé pour servir de commentaire aux *Paradoxes.* Ces *Antiparadoxes* au gré des fins connoisseurs valent encore mieux que les *Paradoxes* et il n'y a—, de tous les écrits qu'on a faits sur l' *Inès de Castro* que ces deux-ci qui méritent d'être achetés, si l'on

[1] Weida I. Th., 1909, p. 40. It is interesting to note that Dost has entirely overlooked a considerable number of criticisms of *Inès de Castro;* for example, several listed in Beauchamp's *Recherches sur les Théâtres,* Paris, 1735, II, 462 ff.

[2] Paris, 1724, p. 45.

en excepte cependant *Les Sentiments du Spectateur Français* par M. Thieriot, le Pollux de M. de Voltaire." Even though Gacon often lacked discretion and a sense of justice in his thrusts against his contemporaries, he seems to have been usually well informed concerning what was taking place in the République des Lettres.

As to the first of these brochures, *Les Antiparadoxes* do not present any problem, for the hitherto unnoticed statement of Gacon that the pamphlet was by Desfontaines seems to contain the only attribution of their authorship.

As to the second, *Le Sentiment d'un Spectateur français,* we meet a bewildering confusion of attributions, which I here enumerate:

I. The pamphlet has been attributed to Marivaux because of the similarity of this title with his *Spectateur français,* but, as Dost points out,[3] Marivaux disclaimed the authorship and all acquaintance with the brochure.

II. Paul Dupont in *Houdar de la Motte*[4] ascribes this criticism of *Inès* to the Abbé Desfontaines. He gives no evidence to support this ascription, and it is possible that he confused this pamphlet with others against La Motte's tragedy known to have been written by the Abbé.

III. In the *Catalogue Général des Imprimés de la Bibliothèque Nationale*[5] it is listed as by Passart. This may perhaps be due to the fact that the Sieur Passart expressed his approbation of several attacks upon *Inès.*[6]

IV. Again, in the *Catalogue Soleinne*[7] the authorship of this brochure is attributed to Voltaire. Unfortunately this attribution is not substantiated by any evidence. It is altogether possible that the Bibliophile Jacob had come upon some tradition or old manuscript note which caused him to lay the authorship of the pamphlet at the door of Voltaire.

V. Bengesco notes this attribution,[8] but classifies the brochure among the works falsely attributed to Voltaire. He quotes as his

[3] *Houdar de la Motte als Tragiker und dramatischer Theoretiker,* p. 40.
[4] Paris, 1898, p. 166.
[5] XXIX, 281.
[6] Cf. Beauchamps, *op. cit.,* p. 462 ff.
[7] 1845, V, 104.
[8] Bengesco, *Bibliographie des Oeuvres de Voltaire,* 1882-1890, IV, 323.

authority for doubting the correctness of the ascription passages from the letter of Voltaire to the authors of the *Nouvelliste du Parnasse* of June 1731: "Un ami ou peut-être un parent de feu M. Campistron me fait des reproches pleins d'amertume et de dureté de ce que j'ai, dit-il, insulté à la mémoire de cet illustre écrivain, dans une brochure de ma façon et que je me suis servi de ces termes indécents, "le pauvre Campistron."—Je ne sais ce que c'est que cette brochure, je n'en ai jamais entendu parler. Je n'ai fait aucune brochure en ma vie; si jamais homme devait être à l'abri d'une pareille accusation, j'ose dire que c'était moi, messieurs."[9] Beuchot, in a note to Voltaire's letter to Madame la Présidente de Bernières[10] also denies Voltaire's authorship of the brochure: "L'une des critiques de cette pièce (*Inès de Castro*) intitulée *Sentiments d'un Spectateur français* a été attribuée à Voltaire, mais sans aucun fondement."

It should be noted that all the attributions mentioned in this list, with the exception of the one to Marivaux, who, as pointed out above, disclaimed the authorship, are modern. It would seem, then, that the only contemporary attribution which has not been disproved is that made by Gacon to Thieriot. Moreover, this attribution, coming from a man well versed in literary affairs of the day, may well be considered more trustworthy than those of later literary historians.

The information contained in Gacon's *Suite du Secrétaire du Parnasse* helps to account for the fact that the brochure in question was attributed to Voltaire. It is well known that Voltaire borrowed Thieriot's name on at least one occasion, to wit: in his letter known as the *Lettre de M. Thieriot à l'Abbé Nadal.*[11] Was it, then, not natural that the conclusion should be made that he borrowed it for *Le Sentiment d'un Spectateur français?* Voltaire was inimical to La Motte at this time, as is evidenced by references in his *Correspondance.*[12] He had been present at the first representation of *Inès de Castro* and its success seems to have annoyed him considerably. Georges Avenel, one of the collaborators of

[9] Voltaire, *Oeuvres*, Moland, XXXIII, 215.

[10] *Ibid.*, XXXIII, 88.

[11] *Ibid.*, XXII, 13.

[12] *Ibid.*, to J. B. Rousseau, Jan. 13, 1722; to Madame de Bernières, June, 1723, etc.

Beuchot, apparently believed that Voltaire had taken an active part in the polemics around the play, for, in a footnote to letter 85 he states that an obscure line "Je viens de recevoir ce que vous savez" refers without doubt to a parody on *Inès*.[13]

In spite of the fact that Vapereau[14] states that Thieriot "n'a rien écrit," it is known that this friend and factotum of Voltaire did write several letters to the Patriarche de Ferney. Moreover, there occurs in Mangold's *Voltariana Inedita*[15] a letter from him to the Crown Prince Friedrich. *Le Sentiment d'un Spectateur français* may very well be from his pen—the only printed pamphlet which we have from him. Even if the contemporary evidence contained in Gacon's statement is not entirely sufficient to prove Thieriot's authorship, this passage is still of interest and importance in that it gives us a clue as to why Voltaire's name came to be linked with *Le Sentiment d'un Spectateur français*.

GEORGE BYRON WATTS.

University of Minnesota.

A NOTE ON THE TOWNELEY *SECUNDA PASTORUM*

The Towneley *Second Shepherds' Play* begins with the entrance of the First Shepherd. After he has soliloquized for some time, the Second Shepherd enters and soliloquizes in his turn. Finally, however, the two shepherds engage in a short dialogue through which we learn that they are expecting a third shepherd, Daw by name. They decide to wait for him where they are. Daw now comes in, but, like the others, begins with a soliloquy. The subject of his complaint is the weather, which, he tells us, is worse than it has been since the days of Noah. After complaining bitterly about the floods, winds, rains and storms, he continues as follows:[1]

[13] *Ibid.*, XXXIII, 90.

[14] Vapereau, *Dict. universel des Litt.*, 1876, p. 1968.

[15] Berlin, 1901, p. 82.

[1] *The Towneley Plays*, ed. George England, *EETS* Extra Series vol. LXXI, p. 120 (stanza 16). Printed also by J. M. Manly, *Spec. of pre-Shakesperean Drama* I 98 f.; S. B. Hemingway, *English Nativity Plays* p. 192; A. S. Cook, *Literary ME Reader* p. 530; J. Q. Adams, *Chief pre-Shakespearean Dramas* p. 147. See also C. G. Child, *The Second Shepherds' Play*

136 We that walk on the nyghtys / oure catell to kepe,
We se sodan syghtys / when othere men slepe.
Yit me thynk my hart lyghtys / I se shrewys pepe;
Ye ar two all wyghtys / I wyll gyff my shepe
A turne. . . .

He now perceives the other two shepherds, and makes haste to greet them in the following terms:

145 A, sir, God you saue! / and master myne!

These words introduce another short passage of dialogue.

My concern in the present paper is with the longer passage quoted above. The interpretation of the passage now current is founded upon Mr. Kittredge's emendation *tall* for the *all* of the text.[2] This reading forces one, of course, to translate *wyghtys* as 'persons,' or something of the sort, and to interpret the word as referring to the other two shepherds. Daw is thus made to address his fellows as early as l. 139, although advocates of this interpretation would doubtless agree that Daw's words were not meant for the shepherds' ears. But if *wyghtys* refers to Daw's fellows, then *shrewys* does too. In other words, Daw catches sight of the other two shepherds at the beginning of l. 138, although he does not greet them until l. 145.[3] Mr. Cook, indeed, makes him see the others at the beginning of l. 136, while Mr. Child has him do the spying at the beginning of l. 137.

Mr. Child, at least, had compunctions about bowing the knee to Kittredge. He tells us,[4] "One would like to regard *two all* as an idiomatic phrase . . . akin to various Middle English phrases having the sense of 'each and every one' . . . but no direct support can be found for this conjecture." Mr. Child might have mentioned in this connexion the familiar *all two* 'both.' The actual reading might then be explained as a scribal inversion—and scribal inversion is surely no wickeder than Mr. Kittredge's scribal omission. Or *two all* might be defended as a possible

p. 34, and *Everyman's Library* vol. 381, p. 56. Mr. Child's translation has recently been reprinted by Brander Matthews and P. R. Lieder in their *Chief British Dramatists* (see p. 15 for our passage).

[2] This emendation was first published, I believe, by Manly (p. 99, note 1). It has been incorporated into the text by Cook, Adams, and Child.

[3] So Adams *loc cit.*

[4] Child, p. 126.

alternative to *all two,* even as *two first* is in fact an alternative to *first two.* But there is still another possibility. Instead of joining *all* to the word immediately preceding it, we might join it to the word immediately following. If we do this, we get *all-wyghtys,* or, in the singular form, *all-wight* = OE. *ælwiht* 'strange creature, uncanny creature' (*Beowulf* l. 1500). The OE. word would develop phonetically to some such form as *alwight* or *allwight,*[5] and a scribe might well make the false analysis into *all* + *wight.* I am therefore inclined to read the passage practically as it stands:

Ye ar two allwyghtys

and to translate: 'Ye are a pair of uncanny creatures.'

But what creatures is Daw addressing? The shrews, of course, which he has just seen peeping from their holes in the ground. In other words, *shrewys* means 'shrew-mice,' not 'rascals' (as Mr. Child would have it). And my translation certainly fits the passage, for it is of the nature of shrew-mice to peep from their holes, whereas one would be put to it to explain why Coll and Gib should be engaged in peeping—they are standing in an open field, remember, with nothing to conceal and no facilities for peeping even if they had been suddenly seized with an insane desire to be furtive. As a matter of fact they were simply waiting for Daw to come up. If they looked in his direction, they looked in a straightforward fashion—at most, they might have peered. The verb *peep* calls for shrew-mice, not for the two shepherds. And Heywood's proverb, *When all shrews haue dind, Chaunge from foule weather to faire is oft enclind,*[6] explains the lightening of heart of which Daw speaks. When Daw saw the shrews peeping out from their holes, he remembered the proverb and his heart grew light at the thought that the weather would get better.

But if shrews brought good weather, they brought less pleasant things as well. There is plenty of evidence that they were looked upon as dangerous, particularly to the flocks and herds. I take from the *NED.* the following quotations which apply:

[5] The prefix means 'strange, foreign, outlandish,' of course, but in *ME* times it would become phonetically identical with the adjective *all.*

[6] See the *NED* s. v. *shrew* 'shrewmouse.'

s. v. *Shrew*

1545 Elyot, *Dict., Mus Araneus* a kynde of myse called a shrew, whyche yf it goo ouer a beastes backe, he shall be lame in the chyne.

1551 Turner *Herbal* 169 The poyson of . . . the feld mouse called a shrew.

1578 Lyte *Dodoens* 622 The poison of the Scorpion and Shrowe and such like venemous beastes.

1600 Surflet *Country Farm* I. xxviii 195 The shrew by her biting of the horse maketh him oftentimes to die.

s. v. *Shrewmouse*

1587 Mascall *Govt. Cattle, Oxen* (1596) 74 The shrouemouse is an ill beast, and doth trouble and hurt mens cattell.

1614 Markham *Cheap Husb., Bull,* etc. xxxix 61 A Shrew Mouse, which is a Mouse with short vneven legges, and a long head, like a Swine, is a venemous thing.

Note also the compounds *shrew-afflicted, shrew-bitten, shrew-struck, shrew-run* 'paralysed (as a result of being run over by a shrew-mouse)' etc. No wonder, then, that Daw told the mice they were uncanny creatures, and hastened to get his sheep out of the way before any damage was done.

The validity of the present interpretation is made certain by Daw's use of the idiom *give a turne.* This is a technical expression used in coursing, an expression which Daw has carried over to the language of everyday life, much as we do with sporting terms and the like. To give the sheep a turn was to make them save themselves from acute and immediate danger by turning sharply in their course and going ahead as fast as possible in a different direction.[7] In this case the danger was indeed at hand. Two shrews were peeping from their holes, and might come out at any moment. Daw therefore took immediate action, to save, not himself, but his sheep.

Let me summarize. At first, Daw is a bit worried. One sees startling things when one is out, at night, in such foul weather. But his heart lightens when he sees a couple of shrews peep, be-

[7] See the *NED* s. v. *turn* sb. II 14.

cause that means fair weather and in fair weather the forces of evil are not abroad. Yet, though Daw is no longer worried about himself, he is worried about his sheep, which may be made lame if the shrews get at them. He therefore drives the beasts away from this dangerous little animal.

KEMP MALONE.

Johns Hopkins University.

REVIEWS

The Chief British Dramatists, excluding Shakespeare. Edited by BRANDER MATTHEWS and PAUL ROBERT LIEDER. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. 1924. Pp. xviii + 1084. $4.00.

Chief Pre-Shakespearean Dramas, a selection of plays . . . by JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. 1924. Pp. vii + 712.

The Houghton Mifflin Co. has done a service both to the student and to the general public in publishing collections of English plays like Mr. Neilson's *Chief Elizabethan Dramatists.* The books under review are welcome additions to the series. They differ markedly in purpose and execution. The *Chief British Dramatists* (hereafter referred to as *CBD*) is a collection of 25 plays meant to "illustrate adequately and even brilliantly the development of the dramatic literature of our language from the Middle Ages to the end of the nineteenth century." In a collection beginning with the Brome play and ending with Henry Arthur Jones, one must of course be content to hit a few of the high spots, and opinions will naturally differ on the choice of the spots. The editors limited themselves, for the most part, to plays "acted on the stage with prolonged success." On the whole, the plays are well chosen (as one would expect them to be), although I regret that *Ralph Roister Doister* was preferred to *Gammer Gurton's Needle* and that Middleton was left unrepresented. When the editors state that "this book has been made for the general reader and student, not for the expert," they both disarm and invite criticism. On the one hand, we can hardly expect a popular book to provide the usual textual apparatus, although when the specific statement is made that a

certain text is being followed,[1] one is a bit disturbed to find that departures from that text are not marked, by notes or otherwise.[2] On the other hand, a book meant for the general reader ought certainly to explain the meaning of unfamiliar words and phrases, make clear the point of allusions and give the source of the quotations that appear in the text. This help would be all the more valuable in view of the fact that even a well informed reader is often put to it to get hold of such information,[3] fundamental though much of it is to him if he is to read with pleasure and understanding. And there is another danger involved in the omission of footnotes. The editors pride themselves on the accuracy of their texts, and so far as I have verified the matter I have found some justification for their pride. Yet when one is not annotating a text one sometimes grows careless about the text itself. Or perhaps it would be fairer to say that the very process of annotation makes for a better text than would otherwise be obtainable. An excellent illustration of this may be found in the third act of the *Way of the World,* where Sir Wilfull tells Witwoud (among other things), "You could intreat to be remembered then to your friends round the rekin."[4] Now once upon a time, for reasons unconnected with the English drama, I read the late Sir John Rhys's interesting paper, *All Around the Wrekin.*[5] By this happy chance, then, I became familiar with the phrase "around the Wrekin" and was led to conclude that the text of our play was faulty at this point and should be emended to "Wrekin." Our editors would doubtless have come to the same conclusion if they had had the task of annotating their "rekin," but since no such duty was laid upon them they let investigation slide and printed as a common noun the name of this hill in Shropshire.

Mr. Adams's volume has a smaller range and, one must add, a greater utility. Mr. Adams explains in his *Preface* the whole point. He says, "I have aimed to tell, as clearly as may be in

[1] As in the case of the *Way of the World* (*CBD* p. vi).

[2] See *CBD* p. 644, col. 2, l. 25.

[3] Thus, not even Mr. Strunk, carefully annotated though his edition is, gives the source of Dryden's quotation from Claudian (*De Cons. Stilich.* III, preface l. 6) in the "Epistle Dedicatory" of his *All for Love* (*CBD* p. 459). Cf. W. P. Mustard, *MLN* XXVIII, 259.

[4] I quote from *CBD* p. 632, col. 2 top.

[5] In *Y Cymmrodor* XXI (1908) pp. 1 ff.

selections, the story of the origin and development of the English drama, to render the plays as intelligible and as vivid to college students as I could, and to make the texts so accurate as to be of genuine service to scholars." The editor has carried out all these aims in the most admirable fashion. He has printed nearly 50 plays, all liberally provided with footnotes for scholar and layman. Of these plays, the first 12 are liturgical plays; the Latin and Mr. Adams's English translation are printed in parallel columns. What with these plays, and the pre-dramatic material which Mr. Adams has printed just before them, the student will gain a very fair conception of the way in which our drama arose. Next come the three liturgical fragments first printed by Skeat, and given by Mr. Adams under the rubric "The Introduction of the Vernacular." Now follows an artificial craft cycle similar to that of Mr. Manly, but more comprehensive. It begins with the Banns of the Hegge Plays (a piece of nomenclature which I decidedly prefer to Mr. Adams's "N. towne Plays"). Other pieces printed by Mr. Adams but not by Mr. Manly are: *Lucifer* (Hegge), *Abel* (Towneley), *Flood* (Chester; Mr. Adams also gives us the Towneley *Flood*), *Pharaoh* (Towneley), *Birth of Jesus* (York), *Chelidonius and Lazarus* (Chester), *Betrayal* and *Trial* (Hegge), *Harrowing of Hell* (Chester), *Resurrection* (Towneley); on the other hand, Mr. Adams does not include the following plays, printed by Mr. Manly: First Norwich *Creation and Fall,* Hegge *Flood,* Towneley *Isaac* and *Jacob,* York *Resurrection,* Chester *Antichrist.* Under "Non-Cycle Plays" Mr. Adams gives us *Duk Moraud, The Play of the Sacrament* and two Digby plays (*St. Paul* and *Mary Magdalene*). Under "Moralities" (= Manly, Part IV), we gain *Everyman* but lose *Mundus et Infans, Hyckescorner* and *Nice Wanton,* a change for the worse, I think. The addition of the *Castle of Perseverance* however makes us even, abridged though it be. Under "Folk Plays" we get the same pieces as those printed in Manly, Part III, except that in place of *Robin Hood and the Potter* Mr. Adams has given us the *Sword Dance* first printed by Sir Walter Scott in his *Pirate.* Under "Farces" we find, besides the good old *Foure PP,* two more plays of Heywood's (*Johan-Johan, Tyb and Syr Johan; Wether*). There are four more rubrics: School Plays (*Roister Doister* and *Gammer Gurton's Needle*); Inns of Court Plays (*Gorboduc* and

Supposes); Court Drama (*Damon and Pithias* and *Campaspe*); and Plays of the Professional Troupes (*Cambises, Famous Victories* and *George a Greene*).

It will be seen that Mr. Adams has provided us with an exceedingly useful book. He has not spared himself in its preparation, and I, for one, am most grateful to him for bringing it to completion. So much for general criticism. As regards details, the time at my disposal was so short that I have been able to examine with care Mr. Adams's treatment of one play only, viz., *Gammer Gurton's Needle*. I offer the results of my examination in the form of a list of suggested footnotes for the play, usually supplementary to Mr. Adams's notes, but sometimes in correction of them. Before giving this list, however, I will mention a couple of details not found in *Gammer Gurton's Needle*. On p. 26, l. 16, it is perhaps not too obvious to be pointed out that *Vetus hospes seculi* means Balaam. I would therefore suggest a footnote to that effect, with a reference to p. 47 bottom. On p. 147, col. 1 bottom, the author's interpretation of the stanza is, I think, erroneous. He was doubtless led into it when he adopted Mr. Kittredge's unfortunate emendation *tall* for *all*. I am printing elsewhere a note on the point, in which I explain in detail what I consider the proper interpretation of the passage.

In the following notes, the reference is always to act, scene and line of *Gammer Gurton's Needle:*

I ii 2, *squrt* 'diarrnoea'; I ii 4, *vylthy glaye* 'filthy clay.' A note on the conventional rustic voicing of initial consonants would be in place here, by way of supplement to the note just above on *cham* 'I am'; I iii 7, *prycked . . . in iagges* 'dressed in rags'; I iii 30, *on her pes* 'to her patching'; I iv 11, *roking* 'crouching' (cf. *coure* I ii 20). See *NED.* s. v. *ruck*. II song 29, *trowle* 'pass'; II i 106, *beraye* 'befoul'; II ii 16, *toyes* 'tricks'; II ii 21, *Here is a good fellow maketh no great daunger*. The line means, 'Here is a good comrade; don't put on such airs.' There should accordingly be a semicolon after *fellow*. II iii 6, *hied* 'sped.' *A man is well hied* means 'A man makes good progress' (spoken sarcastically, of course). Mr. Manly's emendation is unnecessary. II iii 12, *to seek* 'gone'; II iii 20, *paltered* 'mumbled'; II iv 16, *see* 'saw' (cf. IV ii 36 and 40; V ii 224); II iv 38, *callet* 'whore' (the annotation belongs here rather than later); II v 2, *chere* 'manners'; III ii 5, *or* 'before'; III ii 10, *bonable*. To emend to *bomnable* is to spoil the joke; III iii 25, *kut* 'wretch'; *jakes* 'filth'; III iii 26, *skald*, 'scab'; III iii 34,

stued 'from the stews'; III iii 39, *hoddy-peke* 'fool'; III iii 46, *hoyse* 'hoist'; *souse* 'hit'; III iii 48, *tarlether* 'fomenter of evil'; *longs to it* 'goes with it'; III iii 49, *make up thy mouth* 'shut your mouth' (i. e., 'silence you'); III iii 58, *chaunce* 'fate'; III iii 72, *that thou were gone* 'at once'; III iv 3, *dote* 'act queerly'; III iv 18, *rake* 'clean off the anus by scraping with the hand' (a technical term used in farriery); IV i 1, *bandog* 'dog tied up'; IV ii 33, *that I were gone* 'at once'; IV ii 46, *honest* 'honorable'; IV ii 48, *honestie* 'gentry'; IV iii 5, *deuen* 'evening'; IV iv 5, *take her tardy* 'catch her red-handed'; V ii 3, *fained* 'made up, invented'; V ii 29, *and thou groped me* 'whether you seized me'; V ii 62, *dylde* 'reward'; V ii 101, *costard* 'bean' (slang for 'head'); literally, 'apple'; V ii 179, *boxes* 'blows'; V ii 194, *mel* 'meddle'; V ii 204, *amongs* 'meanwhile'; V ii 228, *drift* 'scheme'; V ii 252, *lier lickdish.* Cf. Heywood's proverb: She will lie as fast as a dog will lick a dish; V ii 261, *with you . . . to dispence* 'to let you off.'

KEMP MALONE.

Johns Hopkins University.

Das Wesen der deutschen Romantik. Kritische Studien zu ihrer Geschichte von GEORG STEFANSKY. Hrsg. mit Unterstützung der Gesellschaft zur Förderung deutscher Wissenschaft, Kunst und Literatur in Böhmen. J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung. Stuttgart, 1923. 324 pp.

A doctoral dissertation in the field of German literature based in general upon many years of mature thinking and in particular upon two years of advanced studies in biology, physics, chemistry and medicine, as well as three years of graduate work in history, philosophy and literature, is in itself a rarity. And if in addition such a thesis presents a philosophically, ethnographically, psychologically and esthetically novel and, on the whole, valid interpretation of one of the most perplexing and elusive movements in all literary history, we must ungrudgingly admit that its author has written a unique work. All of this applies to the book under consideration.

In method the work follows quite faithfully the racial and geographical theories of its sponsor, Professor August Sauer of Prague, and their practical application by Professor Josef Nadler

of Freiburg, Switzerland. But it does not content itself with these teachings; it broadens and develops them very perceptibly and utilizes them to great advantage in determining the nature of what is here called the Romantic *Denkform,* in contradistinction to the Classic *Denkform.* The latter, says the author, using a remark of Wilhelm von Humboldt, proceeds *from the idea,* while the former tends *toward the idea.* Further the Romantic form is an intermediate step between an expressly masculine and a purely feminine type and bears, as Nadler has already endeavored to show, an East German stamp, whereas Classicism is characteristically West German. The relation of Romanticism to nature is indirect, manifesting itself usually in symbolism. It would connect the horrible with the beautiful and extend the esthetically beautiful to the broader field of the sublime. The Romantic writers belong, so far as the author's rather equivocal term "irrationalism" is concerned, either to the type of *Magier* (Wackenroder and Brentano) or to that of *Mystiker* (Novalis), or they represent a fusion of the two (Tieck). Finally, Romanticism is an epoch of decadence from the point of view of the history of evolution.

According to the author and his school, literature is, of course, merely one of the ramifications of the large *Kulturzweig* which includes also philosophy and the theory of art. True to this conviction, he considers his subject from every requisite angle, and with marked success. Thus he goes back as far as the Reformation to gather in the many threads making for the religious, political and social development of Germany and the relation of Romanticism thereto. He traces a clear line of evolution from Spener through Lessing and Novalis to Z. Werner. He points to the purely esthetic nature of the religious feeling of Early Romanticism. Everywhere his argument is characterized by sociological premises. The Reformation, for example, is regarded as a necessary consequence of the political conditions in Germany during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; the French Revolution is considered as having been brought about by the fact that the French State under the old régime had become too narrow to permit the cultural life of the nation to assert itself properly; the Classical School was not interested in patriotism because of its absorption in its ideal conception of Greece. Furthermore the book contains exceedingly valuable sections on natural sciences, music and painting, especially the last-mentioned.

As we have already indicated, the author has broadened and developed to a notable degree the *Stammestheorie* of his teachers. He has done so chiefly by toning it down and making it less dogmatic and hence more effective. The best example of this is found in his treatment of Schelling, who, although of Alemannic stock and thus, according to the theory, a Classicist, was so strongly exposed to the Romantic form that the author finds an exception in him and assigns him a position between Classicism and Romanticism. Similarly the author adds weight to the theory by giving it a degree of general flexibility (pp. 119, top; 189, bot.; 191, middle), that is, by admitting in a more or less sweeping manner the existence, side by side with race and geography, of infiltration and influence as literary forces. Such concessions *seem* to weaken the theory; in reality they fortify it. Indeed, aside from its new and highly suggestive revaluation of German Romanticism, the greatest merit of the book, it seems, lies in this more elastic utilization of the theory of *Stamm* and *Landschaft*. For whatever we may think of the general value of the theory (which will yet have to be proved practically and in detail by a long series of minute investigations covering the whole field), we must grant the author that he has rendered it more plausible at least as an approach to Romanticism. A comparison with other recent works on the subject, such as Strich (Deutsche Klassik und Romantik) and Mehlis (Die deutsche Romantik), which use other means of approach, shows to what extent this is true. Stefansky's treatment certainly is more profound and, after one has become accustomed to the intricacies of his style, more helpful and insinuating than that of the others. Possibly his method shows off to the best advantage in the section devoted to contrasted pairs of writers, Goethe-Winckelmann, Lavater-Hamann and Hölderlin-Novalis.

The nature of the book makes it imperative, perhaps, that the author should emphasize more than would seem necessary his method of rationalistic interpretation. It is perhaps also inevitable that he should devote most of his space to the speculative and philosophical writings of the Romanticists, rather than to their works in the field of pure literature. And yet this is to be regretted, for it would seem that many a point now based on the former category could have been made quite as effectively by means of the latter class of works. It appears to the reviewer, therefore, that the title

of the work might well have read: "Das Wesen der romantischen Denkform."

Heine, strange to say, is entirely omitted. Surely the *Stammestheoretiker* are not so enamored of their theory nor so much engrossed in proving it that they would quite ignore this writer, who shows a clear Romantic trend and is at least an important sidelight! It would be an interesting undertaking, indispensable to a complete ethnographic investigation of Romanticism, to develop also Heine's particular *Denkform*. To the reviewer he is most assuredly as much part and parcel of the movement as is Kleist, who bulks large in the author's treatment. If the *Stammestheoretiker* are to prevail, they cannot afford to neglect such phenomena as Heine in a book dealing with the nature of German Romanticism.

Considered as a whole and with a view to the effort that it represents, as well as the results that it achieves, the work is extremely important both with respect to Romanticism and general methodology. It is an illuminating and brilliant study, which penetrates to the very borderland where literature, natural sciences, psychology, philosophy, sociology, human geography and the fine arts meet.

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL.

Indiana University.

Johannes Pauli's *Schimpf und Ernst,* hrsg. von JOHANNES BOLTE. Teil 2 [Alte Erzähler, Teil 2]. Berlin: Herbert Stubenrauch, 1924. 45, 512 pp.

In the May number of the *Modern Language Notes,* 1924, pp. 314-316, I mentioned briefly the first volume of Dr. Johannes Bolte's new edition of Pauli's *Schimpf und Ernst.* The second volume completing the work has just appeared and will earn for the learned editor and his enlightened publisher, Herbert Stubenrauch, the renewed gratitude of all students of the origin and diffusion of that great branch of popular literature known as jests (*Schwänke*), a class usually treated apart from tales (*Märchen*), although many of the problems of origin and diffusion are common to both classes.

The second volume, pp. 45, 512, deals with the additions of later editors, translators, and notes. As Dr. Bolte remarks a work that

in the course of 402 years has been printed at least 68 times and translated into several foreign languages, may well be said to have a history. And this history does not in the present case end with a dry bibliography of the editions printed since 1522, for the extent, tendency and form of Pauli's work have undergone manifold changes under the influence of the times. Although the first edition, reprinted in the first volume, exceeds all subsequent editions, except Oesterley's, in the number of its stories, the later editions exhibit noteworthy variations, and omissions as well as additions, the consideration of which can give us an insight into the changing taste of the times and the powerful influences exerted by the rise of the *Volksbücher* in the sixteenth and following centuries. To these influences belong in the first place the progress of the Protestant spirit and a more exact knowledge of classical antiquity; and in the second place the development of a new central point for German printing in Frankfort on the Main, to which Strassburg and Basel had to yield their former supremacy.

Pauli designed his work for the entertainment and edification of the inmates of the cloisters and noble families on their estates, as well as for the use of preachers. Undoubtedly it made its way into the circle of well-to-do citizens, for the common man it was too costly from its extent and folio form, although in the later editions the number of the stories was reduced and illustrations were introduced to attract the reader. All this was changed when industrious printers, especially in Frankfort on the Main, issued as *Volksbücher* in a cheap and handy form the romances of chivalry and other entertaining literature of aristocratic society. The confused order of Pauli's groups of stories was replaced by a new and clearer arrangement, the tales which seemed antagonistic to the Protestant spirit were eliminated, sometimes a rhymed moral emphasized the didactic nature of the story,—finally new narrative material was taken from the proverbs and fables of antiquity, from the novels of Boccaccio, the Latin facetiae of Poggio and Bebel, the later German collections of jests by Wickram and his followers and from popular oral tradition. So we find in the Frankfort edition of 1560 a very mixed company of 520 stories, which, however, need not fear comparison with the 698 preachers' tales of Brother Johannes Pauli.

This brief résumé indicates the scope of the second volume of

Bolte's monumental work. Pages 9-40 are devoted to the editions of Pauli printed at Strassburg, Augsburg and Bern before 1556, with detailed notices of the great printers Egenolff, Gülfferich, Feyerabend, etc., with a description of the French, Danish, Dutch and other translations. Then follow, pp. 3-116, the additional stories of the editions from 1533 on, 184 in number, and an appendix containing the nine stories told by Pauli in his sermons and taken down by one of his hearers, a nun.

The bibliography follows with the order of the stories in the later editions and translations. A comparative table is also given of the contents and order of the editions of Grüninger, Egenolff, and Gülfferich. We come, finally, to the part of the work most interesting to the student of comparative storiology, viz., the notes by Bolte to the individual stories. These are preceeded by a list of the works most frequently cited. This list is brought up to date in a final note where such recent works as M. Gaster's *Exempla of the Rabbis,* London, 1924 are mentioned. The notes fill pp. 255-446, and illustrate 887 stories. They are what might have been expected from the greatest living scholar in this field. His notes (with Polivka's) to the Brothers Grimm's *Kinder und Hausmärchen* have made his name known to the world of scholars, and he was prepared for the present work by his editions of Wickram and other similar collections.

The work concludes with useful indexes of words and subjects, the latter of which enables one to consult the comparative notes with ease. In glancing over these notes many interesting questions arise as to the origin and diffusion of the stories, many of which are known all over Europe, and some throughout the world. Great masses of them are found in the manuals for the use of preachers, and Pauli's book may, in a certain sense, be considered the last of this interesting class of literature.

I cannot dismiss Bolte's great work without a renewed expression of wonder that in these troublous times a scholar is able with his other multifarious tasks to produce a work demanding such absorbing research, and that a publisher should be found to produce so splendid a specimen of printing lavished on a work of profound scholarship. It will be a thousand pities if young scholars in this country through national prejudice or neglect fail to make

themselves acquainted with methods of study and scholarly ideals which are so finely illustrated in works like the one just considered.

T. F. CRANE.

Cornell University.

Concerning French Verse, an Essay for English-Speaking Readers of French. By C. C. CLARK. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1922. 209 pp. $3.50.

Here is the first readable treatise on French verse in English ever published. It is free of all technical and scholarly discussions, in simple, clear English, an essay rather than a treatise on versification. All historical treatment has been purposely avoided and with reason; for this book was written for the average intelligent person to help him not only to understand the structure and mechanics of French verse and how it differs from English, but also to appreciate and enjoy French poetry. It is possible to make beautiful French verse to one's own rhythmic sense, but not so possible for one to read it so as to make it agreeable to a listener. We must approach French verse with this point in view: "that it is entirely different from the English and that it is based on certain principles which are inevitable while the French language is what it is." In other words: French verse is French verse and not English verse; and English verse is English verse and not French verse. If all English speaking people who desire to learn to appreciate French verse are willing to start from that principle, the greatest difficulty will have been solved.

The title is appropriate, as Professor Clarke does not go into any detailed explanations. Thus, for example, the chapter on *Division of French Verse* simply states time and name without explaining the differences or even the nature of the various divisions. No clearer explanation of the three systems of verse—quantitative, accentual, syllabic—has ever been given. An essential point, too often overlooked, is stressed and should be kept in mind continually—every system of verse is to be "understood only through a proper appreciation of the peculiarity of the respective language."

The chapter on Stress and Rhythm is remarkable for its clear-

ness. In this the author posits syllable-distance (distance measured in syllables) as the basis of rhythm. He, however, does not explain that these syllable-distances are due solely to the utterance or the logical sense; nor that pauses, rhythms, or beats in French verse depend almost entirely upon the logical sense. The impression the reader derives from this chapter and chapter V, *The Basic Rhythm of French Verse,* is that rhythm consists of a certain number of syllables, rhyme, and arrangement of words so that the last syllable of each line is stressed. This may seem rather mechanical, and the monotony of which he speaks on p. 54-55 illustrated by his *a* scheme would naturally make one feel a monotony where there really is none.

The chapter on *Mute e* seems too long and technical in comparison with the treatment given to other principles. It assumes too much knowledge of pronunciation. The reader should be told that *mute e* is counted in French verse whether pronounced or not (giving exceptions) and made aware of the fact that there are two distinct methods, schools, or tendencies: verse is read as prose by some, as verse by others; in ordinary conversation some pronounce, some do not pronounce *mute e.*

After reading the chapter on Syllable Counting, the reader will undoubtedly be left somewhat bewildered. The author, to avoid dryness and long enumerations, has cut out all definite rules to be found in any short treatise of verse. In this respect the book is unique, and the author deserves praise for his courage.

Many points might be discussed in which the reviewer would differ from the author, but the book deserves the highest commendation for the skill and discrimination shown in presenting such a difficult subject in such an agreeable manner.

HUGO P. THIEME.

University of Michigan.

Contribution à l'étude du vocabulaire d'Alphonse Daudet. By IVAN PAULI. *Lunds Universitets Arsskrift, N. F., Avd.* 1, *Bd.* 16, *Nr.* 6, 1921.

By reading the works of Daudet,—to all appearances with greater exhaustiveness than his predecessor, Miss Mary Burns,[1] the author

[1] *La langue d'Alphonse Daudet* (Paris, 1916).

has found seven hundred words not taken up by the earlier treatise (p. vi). These, with many "remarques," supplementing or criticizing the observations of Miss Burns, constitute the body of the discussion.

Pauli sounds a significant note in his introduction. In answering the question of Brunot: "Qui tentera le Lexique de la langue poétique de notre temps?", he makes it clear that nobody can attempt it without the aid of a series of exhaustive monographs on the vocabulary of the eminent writers of the 19th and 20th centuries, monographs using a definite criterion in the choice of words to be treated and based on accurate texts. The last clause ought to be especially emphasized, for modern, as well as mediaeval texts, require close scrutiny.[2]

In a footnote to the first page of the introduction we are given a list of the efforts to study the language of 19th century writers. A grave omission is the failure to mention Mlle L. Vincent, *La langue et le style de George Sand dans les romans champêtres,* Paris, 1916—reviewed, before Pauli's publication, in *RPF,* XXI (1919) 14, *MLN,* XXXV (1920) 228 [G. Chinard], *MLR,* XV (1920) 327—which, whatever its faults, is wider in scope than Born's work, cited by Pauli.

A commendable feature is the comparison of Daudet's usage with that of other novelists of the century. In this connection, the present reviewer permits himself to add references to the use by George Sand of certain words treated by Pauli: *fade* (8) in *Jeanne,* 73, 83, 230, 231 and *Fadette,* 66, 124; *mitan* (21) in *Jeanne,* 267, *Maîtres Sonneurs,* 57, 129, 134, 191, 369, *Bois- Doré,* II, 180; *pastoure* in *Jeanne,* passim. *Jambé* (99), in the expression *mal jambé,* showing a sense analogous to that of Daudet's use, occurs in *Fadette,* 68. These references would have been known to Pauli had he been acquainted with the work of Vincent, mentioned in the last paragraph. Moreover, we note the analogous use of *vanné* (33) in the expression *vanné de fatigue,* the occurrence of which in *Meunier d'Angibault* 243, *Jeanne* 230 and

[2] Cf. E. P. Dargan, *Balzac's Method of Revision,* read before the Modern Language Association, Dec. 28, 1922. Apropos of Balzac, it may be added that, to the best of the writer's knowledge an adequate treatment of Balzac's rich vocabulary is still wanting.

Claudie, Act I, sc. 1, ought to be mentioned. The argument over *agourmandir* (14) could be more easily settled by mention of the past participle *agourmandé* (cit. Godefroy-Salmon) and its parallel *abouter* (Vincent, *op. cit.,* p. 36). Incidentally, *abouter,* as well as *mignot* and *arbrer* are to be found in *Old French* (Godefr.-Salmon).

The inclusion of a number of words is open to question, or, at least, comment: *casse-cou* (adj. 88), *ficher* (46), *foutre* (46, 47), *gosse* (47), *grue* (37, i. e. as 'woman of loose morals'), *mâtin* interj., 49), *potache* (29), *varsovienne* (90), *victoria* (91) are cited by Larousse (*Grand dictionnaire universel,* [1866-90]); *fichtrement* (46), *marsouin* (48, as 'marine'), *être dans la purée* (50), *rouquin* (51), *tonitruant* (31) are to be found in the *Nouveau Larousse Illustré* (1898-1904), but not in the larger work.[3] It is true that the author states expressly that he includes only words that are not given by the dictionaries of the Academy, Hatzfeld-Darmesteter-Thomas, and Littré. Yet, seeing that Pauli even cites the occurrence of the items in the glossaries of *argot,* he should have at least mentioned them as found in Larousse, despite the popular nature of this work. Moreover, apropos of *varsovienne,* we find that it was imported about 1854; there is evidence that it was a widespread term. If it be granted that the function of a scholar who studies the language of an author is to take up the terms that are in some manner distinctive, the special nature of such words as are cited in the last paragraph might well have been made clearer by additional data.

In general, the *Contribution* of Pauli is worthy of its name. The lexicographer who is to treat the literary language of the nineteenth century (and mayhap also of the twentieth) will find in it a valuable aid.

A. H. Schutz.

University of Missouri.

[3] *Vieille barbe* (32), in the general sense of 'old man' is given by Littré (1872) and still earlier by Bescherelle (1845). Cf. *vieille moustache.* 'old veteran' (Nyrop, *Grammaire Hist.,* IV, § 256, 1), also the following example: "S'il avait de la barbe, je dirais que c'est une vieille barbe de '48" (Ordonneau, Valbrègue, Kéroul, *Les Boulinard,* performed in 1890,—Act III, sc. 1, p. 63 in Harriman's edition, Boston, D. C. Heath & Co.).

Chaucer: The Clerkes Tale of Oxenford, Edited by KENNETH SISAM. (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1923, xxvi + 78 pp.)

This is an attractive little book. There are numerous plates, showing, among other things, some of the illuminations from the Munich manuscript of the *De Casibus,* a picture of the well of St. Thomas, and the portrait of Chaucer from the Ellesmere manuscript; and there is a map of the pilgrimage route to Canterbury, and even one of northern Italy (to show where Padua is situated, as well as Piedmont). The Introduction tells something of the tradition of the Griselda story, something of Chaucer's knowledge of Boccaccio and Petrarch; it sketches the problem of dating the *Clerk's Tale,* and the connection of the Tale with the Marriage Group. There are also: a compact account of Chaucer's life, a select bibliography, the "portrait" of the Clerk conveniently quoted from the General Prologue, and, after the text, the prologue of the *Merchant's Tale* wisely added. The apparatus includes a brief study of the language, a note on the metre, and a glossary. This summary of the contents is enough to show that the volume is intended as an introductory primer to Chaucer, and for this purpose its size and material are appropriate.

One is led immediately to inquire, however, why the *Clerk's Tale* should be selected with that end in view. The story of Griselda is representative of one variety of Medieval literature, and yet it also suited the taste of later periods as well. Much more than that, it stands in bad need of its context to be representative of Chaucer. Few of the other *Canterbury Tales* are likely to suffer so much from isolation from their framework. It is hard to imagine, in fact, how the present editor could have appreciated to the full the amazing fashion in which the particular appeal of the story is transmuted by its relationship, in detail, to the monologue of the Wife of Bath and to the other items of the Marriage Cycle. For if Mr. Sisam has observed the alchemy by which pathos becomes tinged with humor and humor with pathos, through the very fact that the Clerk of Oxenford is speaking in such excessive praise of at least one woman, how can he wish to cut away the connections which serve so vitally to bind this story to what has preceded? In a more extravagant way, but no more definitely, we should lose the meaning of the "litel thing in prose," if we took the *Tale of Melibeus* away from its association with Sir Thopas.

This is no place to repeat the evidence for this interpretation of the story. One may note, however, that some of it has not made a favorable impression on Mr. Sisam, when he says that "perhaps the MSS. are right when they call [the Envoy] 'L'envoy de Chaucer,'" although we find therein the definite allusion (1207 ff.) to the *Wife of Bath's Tale.* I observe too that he regards the passage marked "Auctor" (995 ff.) as also Chaucer's own (see his note) in spite of the following line: "Thus seyden sadde folk." One may compare what is more likely to be a real interruption elsewhere in Chaucer's drama (G. 992 ff.) and see how different the manner is. I wonder how many critics will attribute even lines 460 ff. to Chaucer rather than to the Clerk. In the same way it is fair to protest that dramatic reasons led Chaucer to describe himself as looking on the ground after the sadness of the *Prioress's Tale,* and not the matter of personal habit (cf. Sisam, p. xvii and Knott, *Mod. Philol.* VIII, 135 ff.)

Other comments may be briefly suggested. For full information about the Griselda story we may await the publication of Professor Manly's Lowell lecture; the authorities he cites there should be consulted. In the *Index to the Ballad-Entries in the Stationers' Register* (No's. 2486, 482), Professor Rollins proposes that the "Sonnge of pacyente Gressell" is what has been preserved in Phillip's *Commodye.* He has also found some other interesting entries which are *apropos.* As to Boccaccio's composition of the *De Genealogiis Deorum,* it must not be felt that all was loss in this remarkable work, for its wide influence is coming more and more to be recognized. In studying Chaucer's additions to his source further inferences might have been made: particularly, the way in which lines 852-61 emphasize and extend Griselda's brief moment of rebellion, and thus serve to make her more human (as do lines 1086 ff. in expressing her emotion at the reunion). The notes are in general good, especially that on the comparison of "hende Nicholas" with the Clerk. The study of the language is adequate, although one may recall the fact that *e* < A. S. *y* is found in the London dialect and elsewhere in East Midlands in the fourteenth century (cf. Wyld's *Short History of English,* London, 1921, section 158, pp. 101-2). It should no longer be called a "distinctive feature of the Kentish dialect" in Middle English. In the Glossary it is a pity that etymologies or immediate sources were not

given; but here one notes how slight Mr. Sisam's grammatical review is, not including for instance the source of final *e* in Anglo-Saxon feminine nouns (as in *loore,* 87, 788). One quarrels sometimes with his translations of the Middle English: *sentence* (l. 636), according to its context and regular use, denotes "intent" or "opinion"; *shrewe* (1222) preserves its meaning of an "evil person," as again the context shows. One other small matter: Hengwrt has not become "Hengwyrt" (p. xxiv) unless "it be falle of-newe"!

HOWARD R. PATCH.

Smith College.

CORRESPODENCE

A SOURCE FOR BALZAC'S *Le Faiseur*

The enthusiasm of Honoré de Balzac for Rabelais, due not only to the fact that both men were born in Touraine, but also to the many points of likeness in their natures, found its most striking expression in the *Contes drolatiques.* It was, however, shown here and there in his other writings. Rabelais' influence was not limited to inspiration, as may be seen by the close imitation of his language in the *Contes drolatiques.* He sometimes borrowed both the ideas and the turns of expression of his great compatriot. An interesting example occurs in the drama *le Faiseur.*

It will be recalled that though this work mainly presents the distressing tragedy of debt, it is occasionally enlivened by lighter touches. It is in one of these less consequential passages that the example in question occurs. M. Mercadet, the principal character of the drama, is discussing his debts with his wife. In reply to her misgivings on the subject he says, "Quel est l'homme qui ne meurt pas insolvable envers son père? Il lui doit la vie, et ne peut pas la lui rendre. La terre fait constamment faillite au soleil! La vie, madame, est un emprunt perpétuel!"[1]

The ideas he expresses are evidently taken from Panurge's celebrated eulogy of debts, found in the *Tiers Livre,* where the careless spendthrift, rebuked by his friend Pantagruel for his extravagance and asked when he will ever get out of debt, replies, "In the Greek calends," that is, "never." He then breaks out in impassioned praise of debt. For him it is the symbol of the sense of mutual obligation which binds the material universe and human society together. Continuing, he pictures a universe without debts: "Le

[1] *Œuvres complètes de Honoré de Balzac,* Paris, Michel Lévy, 1870, XVIII, 478.

Soleil ne luyra sus leur terre; les astres ne y feront influence bonne; car la Terre desistoit leurs prester nourrissement par vapeurs et exhalations: des quelles, disait Heraclitus, prouvaient les Stoïciens, Ciceron maintenoit, estre les estoiles alimentées."[2]

In chapter four Panurge describes a universe where debts abound. It is the home of joy. All the parts of human society and the human body are united. Man then thinks of offspring: "Ce monde, prestant, debvant, empruntant, est si bon que, ceste alimentation parachevée, il pense desja prester à ceux qui ne sont pas encores nés; et, par prest, se perpetuer s'il peut, et multiplier en images à soi semblables, ce sont enfans"—the rest of the paragraph will hardly bear quotation.[3]

M. Mercadet next says to his wife, "Et n'emprunte pas qui veut!"

Panurge, his model, had said, "Toutesfois, il n'est debteur qui veult; il ne fait crediteurs qui veult."[4]

M. Mercadet then launches into a description of the blissful condition of a debtor: "Ne suis-je pas supérieur à mes créanciers? J'ai leur argent, ils attendent le mien; je ne leur demande rien, et ils m'importunent! Un homme qui ne doit rien, mais personne ne songe à lui, tandis que mes créanciers s'intéressent à moi!"

Panurge says: "Devezvous tousjours à quelqu'un? Par iceluy sera continuellement Dieu prié vous donner bonne, longue cet heureuse vie: craignant sa debte perdre, tousjours bien de vous dira en toutes compagnies, tousjours nouveaulx crediteurs vous acquestera: afin que par eux vous faciez versure et de terre d'autrui remplissez son fossé."[5] And again, "Cuidez vous que je suis aise, quand, tous les matins, autour de moy, je voy ces crediteurs tant humbles, serviables cet copieux en reverences."[6]

One can but admire the good sense with which Balzac thus turned to Rabelais when he needed wit with which to enliven his comedy. The unrelieved seriousness of his preceding dramas had contributed to their failure. On the other hand, Rabelais' boisterous though sometimes heavy pleasanteries, cleverly imitated, had won the suffrage of the literary world for *les Contes drolatiques*. Now he again drew from the same fountain and produced, in *le Faiseur*, both a theatrical and an artistic success.[7]

GILBERT M. FESS.

Hillsdale College.

[2] *Œuvres de Rabelais*, ed. MM. Burgaud des Marets et Rathery, Paris, Didot, 1870, I, 526, 2e édition.

[3] P. 532.

[4] P. 525.

[5] P. 523. See the two following pages for a continuation of the subject.

[6] P. 525.

[7] For the initial form of Balzac's ideas expressed above, see his *Pensées, sujets, fragmens*, ed. J. Crépet, Paris, A. Blaizot, libraire-éditeur, 1910, p. 46.

An Address to the Electors of Great Britain . . . Possibly a Fielding Tract

Mr. Frederick S. Dickson, the donor of this two-part pamphlet, records on the page opposite the Yale University Library bookplate several interesting facts and opinions. I quote in full:

"This Address was published in London by Drummond and Company in August 1739. (See the London Mag. p. 416 and the Gentlemans Mag. p. 444.) [The copy presented by Mr. Dickson is dated 1740 Edinburgh.]

According to our Bibliography (pp. 301, 302) we know of nothing from the pen of Henry Fielding after the appearance of The Historical Register on May 12, 1737 until the printing of the first number of the Champion on November 15, 1739, a period of two years and a half, save for some brief letters in Common Sense. Fielding was practically through with the drama and his work on the Champion showed the trend of his mind towards politics.

If this tract ultimately appears to be the work of Henry Fielding it will prove to be an item of the first importance as it serves to fill in some measure a period apparently vacant, and would be the first of Henry Fielding's luminous essays on public affairs. This pamphlet appeared when he was in the midst of his law studies and the references in the first part of this Address to the subjects on which he was then working is to say the least significant.

My own opinion is that Henry Fielding wrote this paper.

March 19, 1923. Frederick S. Dickson."

Now in first looking over this pamphlet the reader finds much to persuade him that Fielding is the author. He sees at once that the old familiar word usage is prevalent, and upon a close examination finds an almost unvaried use of *hath, doth, shew, whilst.* "Yes," says the reader, "this is Fielding." On the title page he reads "Done by an Eminent Hand," and on page 56, "The Author is industriously conceal'd, tho' the Daily Gazetteer, in a mad Fit of Anger, ascribes it to Mr. Fielding." In his cursory examination the reader finds quotations and citations from Lord Coke, Harrington, Cambden, Bracton, Hale, Echard, Matthew Paris, Lock, Rapin, Aristotle, Machiavel, Montagne, and other authorities in Fielding's library or otherwise dear to his legal and historical mind. In two instances he finds the word *Champion,* suggestive of Herculean labors of Fielding; on page 11 a satirical reference to Great Men, "if Titles can make Men great"; and on pp. 70 ff., a reasoned attack on the greatest of all great men, the Prime Minister, Robert Walpole; and on page 88, a very characteristic reference to Jonathan Wyld—all persuasively suggestive of Fielding the political reformer.

If any of the above spellings trouble my reader he may find comfort in the thought that they trouble me. Fielding did once use the spelling *Wyld* (See Cross' *History* I, 380); but I have never before seen *Cambden*, p. 22, 24, *murther* and *murtherer*, pp. 86, 87, 9; *conveened*, p. 23; *Lawier*, pp. 24, 30 (but *yer*, p. 66); *skreen*, p. 51; *Cam* for *Cham*, p. 69. The spellings *Lock*, *Machiavel*, and *Montagne* are customary with Fielding, and in the form *ly* for *lie* (p. 90) Mr. Dickson finds a familiar spelling. On this basis I am inclined at one moment to say this cannot be Fielding, and at the next moment to reverse my decision. And there are other difficulties. Can some student of Fielding tell me when and where he first mentions "the great Sydney"? In this pamphlet he is referred to six times; but I have no remembrance of such a name [1] in Fielding. Was Fielding capable of so bad a sentence as this on p. 93: "Even your Corruptors will then justly despise you, and insult your names behind your Backs; as they now affront your Understanding as well as your Honesty to your Faces, when they offer you a Ball, a Treat, a Purse, or a Bank-Bill, in barter, for what, if you are base enough to sell, they, in a mere venal and worldly Sense of Bargaining, are not rich enough to pay you the Price of." ? Eight times (at least) the word *nay* occurs; does this stir any remembrance in the lovers of Fielding?

Very likely I am too easily persuaded, but I feel sure that this pamphlet is the work of Henry Fielding. It lacks the wit and maturity of the Fielding I know best, but in general style and usage it is markedly characteristic of our author. It is written in the mood of seriousness which might well be the mood of the budding lawyer; it is an opposition tract directed against Fielding's ancient political enemy so celebrated in the *Champion* and in other works of the period. Fielding the magistrate had a very unselfish and noble conception of service to the state; this pamphlet is conceived in the identical spirit of practical idealism.

GERARD E. JENSEN.

Connecticut College.

A NEW ANALOGUE TO THE *Pardoner's Tale*

From 'Flaundres, whylom' to San Francisco of the present day is a Brobdingnagian halloo, indeed; yet in *Just Meat*,[1] Jack London has retold the old tale of Chaucer in the latter place and time. Since London's analogue has not, to my knowledge, been noted,[2] I should like to call attention to it here, representing as it does an interesting pejoration of the ancient Oriental theme.

[1] Sidney, Algernon. His *On Government* (Folio, Lond. 1751) was in Fielding's Library.

[1] Jack London, *When God Laughs*, N. Y., 1911, pp. 93-128.

[2] Miss Hammond, *Chaucer, A Bibliographical Manual*, N. Y., 1908; p.

A diamond merchant, having concealed a hoard of diamonds and pearls in his home, preparatory to leaving the country and his unsuspecting partner, is accidentally killed in a skirmish with Matt, a thief. The gems are taken to the room of Matt and his accomplice, Jim; where, on the following morning, the latter poisons the other's coffee and, in turn, eats of a steak strychnined by Matt. Both die after many realistic details of agony.

The main resemblances to Chaucer's narrative are immediately apparent—the underlying motive of avarice, the number of characters concerned,[3] the death of one by violence and of the other two by poison.[4] Important elements of the old theme, however, are either completely lacking or greatly changed.

The warning character,[5] Canby's *x* factor,[6] is entirely absent. The *accidental* killing of the first character, on the other hand, is a feature not current in any of the analogous stories. In all, there is a deliberate intention, if not actual plot, toward the death of the first. Finally, the poisoning of the survivors by each other, and not by the prearrangement of their victim, is a corruption found only in the *Arabian Nights* version of the tale.[7] Since, in this last rendering, the first character escapes death entirely, we may place London's version before it in the scale of pejoration.

Just Meat was written in 1906, although not published until 1911,[8] after London's visit to the Orient. It is not improbable that on that journey he came in contact with some corrupt form of the legend and turned it to his own narrative use. Part of this last would seem to consist in the emphasis upon details of the death agonies of the poisoned men.

WHITNEY WELLS.

Harvard University.

296, mentions only Kipling's story of *The King's Ankus* as a modern parallel.

[3] One thousand and one in the Buddhist original; five hundred in the Tibetan version; six in *The King's Ankus;* four in the Kashmiri version and Coryat; three in the Persian, all the Arabian, the Italian *Miracle of St. Antonio,* the *Libro di Novelle,* and Chaucer versions; two in the *Cento Novelle Antiche* version; indefinite in the *Morlini Novellae* version. (References: *Originals and Analogues,* Ch. Soc. Pub.; pp. 130-134, 418-430; G. L. Kittredge, "Coryat and the Pardoner's Tale," in *Modern Language Notes,* Vol. xv, pp. 385-7; R. Kipling, *The Jungle Book,* N. Y., 1897, p. 214). Three, however, is the most common number.

[4] As in the Persian, first and second Arabian, *Miracle of St. Antonio,* and *Libro di Novelle* versions, likewise.

[5] Gautama in the Buddhist original, Jesus in the Persian, first Arabian and *Cento Novelle Antiche* versions; St. Anthony in the Italian miracle; the hermit in the *Libro di Novelle* version; the old man in Chaucer; and the White Cobra in Kipling.

[6] H. S. Canby, "Some Comments on the Sources of Chaucer's *Pardoner's Tale,*" in *Modern Philology,* Vol. II, p. 477.

[7] The third Arabian verson. In the Coryat version there is no death by violence. Each pair of brothers poisons the other pair.

[8] C. London, *Jack London,* London, 1921, Vol. II, p. 135.

A Reply

I have been reading your reviewer's critique of my volume *Les Techniques de la critique et de l'histoire littéraires* and am left with the unfortunate impression that the casual reader will suppose, from the review and the innuendoes of the review, that I have committed some fault of honor in publishing a work on a subject which has been my life long study, because the publication of Mr. Morize's work preceded mine by some months. My own book, embodying the results of ten years lecturing on the methodology of criticism, was completed on 6. November, 1922. It was on that date that I wrote to the Secretary to the Delegates of the Oxford University Press offering the manuscript, which I delivered on the twelfth of the same month. No substantive amplifications or corrections, other than verbal corrections, were made in it after that date. It was set up actually in page proof starting in January of 1923 before I had even heard of a competitor.

I first heard of Mr. Morize's book from his letter which was forwarded to me in Paris during the following April. In acknowledging the letter I told Mr. Morize that my book had been printing since December, and that I would not read his book until my own was published. His book I found at Oxford on my return, and in fact, owing to the pressure of many duties, I have not yet read it. My only fault, it appears, is that I added the title of his work to my Bibliography, out of generosity for a competitor, without making it clear that I had not read it.

If I must go still further into detail, I would add that I gave 1923 as the date of publication of Mr. Morize's book because I gathered from Mr. Morize's own letter (received in April, 1923) that it had just been published.

Your reviewer comments acidly on my dealing with three works of Diderot, Pascal, and La Boétie in a certain order. I dealt with them because they are the three outstanding works in French which illustrate my point, and I dealt with them in this order because it is the only methodological order. It is inevitable that Mr. Morize, if he takes the same point, should have both chosen them and taken them in this order. The coincidence, if I may say so, is no other than the coincidence of a good knowledge of the subject.

G. Rudler.

Oxford University.

[I did not mean to imply in my review that Professor Rudler had committed a fault of honor in publishing his book and I very much regret it, if anyone has drawn any such conclusion from my comments. What I was trying to show was that Professor Rudler had not in his book given an altogether satisfactory model of literary method. I still think that Professor Morize's book de-

served from him a more extended mention than a bibliographical note of one line, but I fully accept Professor Rudler's explanation of his entire independence with regard to it and am confident that the readers of *M. L. N.* will do likewise.—H. C. L.]

A MS. of Mellin de Saint-Gelais' Works

It may be of interest to call attention to a Vatican manuscript of Mellin de Saint-Gelais' works, unknown to editors of that poet and apparently unsignalled hitherto. Regina latina 1493 is a carefully written paper MS. of the sixteenth century, in-folio, measuring 33.2 cm. by 21.3 cm. and contains 152 folios of which the text occupies 144 and the index eight. The poems are written in single columns of thirty lines to the column. A later hand has occasionally added titles, rubrics and notes.

The collection is very full and includes the *Genèvre* (fol. 124 v-129 v) with the continuation of Baïf (130 r-143 r). Although it gives us no new poems, its readings are of considerable value in furnishing new variants [1] and in confirming others hitherto suggested only by modern editors.[2] It often agrees with the accurate Henry the Second MS.[3] and has one poem (III, 109) and two distichs (II, 30, 31) known only from that MS., as well as three quatrains—added in the later hand—also found only there (II, 15, 16). On the other hand, it does not contain the other nineteen poems which occur in that MS. alone, and in certain readings it agrees with the 1574 edition rather than with the Henry the Second MS. or with the first edition of 1547.[4]

Unfortunately, Blanchemain's edition gives only incomplete and inadequate information regarding variants, so that it is impossible, for example, to establish the relation of the Vatican MS. to the lost Des Portes MS. used by La Monnoye.[5] In fact only a complete collation of all the MSS. and editions would satisfactorily determine the exact position of this new collection. Even superficial comparisons, however, will show that its completeness, reliability, and independence entitle it to high rank, and it must certainly be consulted in any new edition of Saint-Gelais' works.

Grace Frank.

[1] Notably in the poems printed in Blanchemain's edition (Bibliothèque Elzévirienne, 1873): I, 63, 100, 105, 215, 283, 304, 308; II, 196, 202, 259.

[2] For example in the poems printed in Blanchemain's edition: I, 283 (line 7; cf. III, 302); II, 51, 155, 192.

[3] Cf. I, 104, 210, 305; II, 15, 35, 106, 135, 215, 228.

[4] For instance in I, 53, 61, 89, 90, 97, 102, 110, 111, 112, 255, 257, 264; II, 58, 86, 111, 176 (variant c); III, 133.

[5] It agrees with an unidentified MS. known to La Monnoye (probably the Des Portes) in stating that II, 19 was written "pour Madlle de Roman," though these words are in the annotating hand. It contains none of the variants cited by Blanchemain from the La Rochethulon MS.

Old Saxon *Fercal*

This word occurs but once in the Old Saxon *Heliand,* line 5773, and has clearly the meaning of 'bolt':

uuas fercal manag antheftid fan helldoron.

Petersson, *Indogerm. Forschungen* XXIII, 398, has connected the word with Latin *pergula* 'shed, outhouse.' This is impossible (cf. Walde, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch,* page 576). No other explanation has, as far as I am aware, been attempted. Yet the word can surely be nothing else than mediaeval Latin *vericulum* or *veruculum* (cf. French *verrou*), which under the Germanic stress became (*verculum*<*verclum*<*vercl*<) *fercal. f* for Latin *v* in loan-words occurs frequently (cf. Latin *versus*<Old High German *vers* or *fers;* Braune, *Ahd. Gramm.* § 137, Anm. 2). For the secondary vowel *a* cf. goth. *fugls*<OHG. *fogal.*

Edward H. Sehrt.

Gettysburg College.

BRIEF MENTION

A few years ago professors of French were vying with one another in publishing elementary grammars. Now it is the turn of general histories of French literature. One of the most important of these is *A History of French Literature* by Kathleen T. Butler, New York, E. P. Dutton and Co., 2 vols. (1923). The author is widely read and displays both taste and a marked gift for exposition. The fact that she is an Englishwoman does not prevent her appreciating things French. She has wasted none of the 900 pages at her disposal. In short her book may be considered among the best histories of French literature in English, although it has certain faults that cannot be overlooked.

However large the nineteenth century may loom, the author is not justified in devoting to it half her work, nor do historians of the Romantic period deserve twice the space given to dramatists from Scribe to 1914. A more serious criticism lies in the fact that the reader who wishes to go farther than the author can take him is not shown whither to turn. Many of the critics cited are Englishman of small importance to the student of French literature and the lists of suggested readings appended to her two volumes omit many essential books and articles. Finally, there is a considerable amount of carelessness in detail. One is told, for instance, that Saint-Gelais introduced the sonnet into France (I, 120), that French pastoral plays before 1607 were based on Spanish models (I, 202), that Corneille's *Menteur* is a comedy of intrigue (I, 263), that his last plays are melodramas (I, 206), that Pellisson

was one of the founders of the French Academy (I, 216). It is misleading to assert that "in everything but religion Voltaire was a conservative" (I, 386), that Pixérécourt was "classical in form" (II, 9), that Chateaubriand visited "the wilder parts of America" (II, 19), that non-dogmatic criticism starts with Mme de Staël (II, 178), that *Monsieur Alphonse* has no human interest (II, 281), that Becque's characters are "all of a piece" (II, 285), that Porto-Riche "kept aloof" from the writers of the *Théâtre libre* (II, 286). Incorrect dates are given for the first part of the *Astrée* (I, 175), for *Sophonisbe, les Visionnaires, Polyeucte* and other plays (I, 175), 252, 206). Triboulet is presented with a son (II, 108), *Mélisande* with a rival (II, 322). There are numerous mistakes in the French, of which the most amusing is the thrice occurring *langue d'œil* for the speech of northern France (I, 5, 48). It is unfortunate that a book on which so much labor has been expended and which has so many excellent qualities was not submitted before publication to a number of specialists so that it might be made thoroughly satisfactory. In short it deserves a revision and an amplified bibliography. When the new edition appears, there should also be a revision in the price, for no rival author will wish to profit by the continuance of the present prohibitive charge of $9., which I can explain only as a misdirected effort on the part of the publisher to protect the American professor against English competition.

A much smaller book is Dr. Maxwell A. Smith's *Short History of French Literature,* New York, Henry Holt and Co. (1924), which is intended merely to guide undergraduates in their first grand tour. It succeeds in giving a generally correct account of important authors and tendencies, though some of the former (Marot, Montaigne, Becque) are not satisfactorily discussed, while others (Régnier, Retz, Saint-Simon) are omitted altogether. There are, moreover, such unfortunate mistakes as these: that Latin displaced Celtic throughout Gaul *except in Brittany* (p. 1); that Malherbe was a favorite of *Catherine* de Medici (p. 36); that, with the exception of the *Princesse de Clèves, Gil Blas, Candide,* and *Manon Lescaut,* "we find practically no attention paid to the genre of the novel before the appearance of Rousseau's *Julie*" (p. 211). If the author were better acquainted with the results of modern scholarship, he would not overlook Bédier's work on the *chansons de geste,* put the composition of *Gargantua* before that of *Pantagruel,* remark on the originality of Rabelais's educational ideas, repeat the discredited statement about de Chalons and the *Cid,* or the legends that Henriette d'Angleterre suggested the subject of *Bérénice* and that Lamartine did not correct his text. I doubt the wisdom of making such debatable statements as that English is a more poetic tongue than French (p. 1), that Racine's language is not only restricted, but artificial, or that Augier's

work has outlived that of Dumas *fils*. Certainly Lanson would be surprised to find himself described as a disciple of Brunetière. The last chapter will be of small assistance to a sophomore. It is a fifty page essay on living writers by Mlle Blanche Cognet which is not only out of proportion with the rest of the book, giving more space to Colette Willy than is elsewhere devoted to Mme de Sévigné, but which is translated by Dr. S. into such highly gallicized English that it has become, to use one of his phrases, utterly "inept at the expression of thought."

H. C. L.

Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic, interpreted from Representative Works. By Charles Sears Baldwin. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1924).

The rhetorical works of Aristotle and Cicero compressed into fifty-five pages; the teachings of Quintilian, Seneca the Elder, Tacitus, and Pliny concerning rhetoric in thirty-nine; and the critical treatises of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and The Great Unknown (Longinus) in twenty-nine: such is the digest made by Dr. Charles Sears Baldwin of Columbia University, preparatory to a further consideration of the views of representative ancient writers on poetics. This union of two linguistic lines in one work has been arranged in order to bring before the present generation of English students the best thought of antiquity on the "pro-progressive art of words." Aware of the severity of the process to which he has submitted the original treatises, the author frequently calls the attention of the reader to future works in which he will expand the subjects thus summarily treated. As guides for interested readers and for graduate students of rhetoric and poetic, selective references to numerous authorities and translations are given in the footnotes, the names of such scholars as Westermann, Spengel, Blass, Christ-Schmidt, Volkmann, and Norden being purposely omitted. The volume closes with a compressed tabular index of Greek and Latin rhetorical terms.

If one were to venture a prophecy, after reading Dr. Baldwin's summary, it would be this: In the renaissance of rhetoric which is manifesting itself by numerous oral and written courses in preparatory schools and colleges and by graduate work in universities, a stimulating touch of general scholarship has been given which will certainly be followed by numerous detailed treatises, such as that of Dr. D. L. Clark on *Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance*, Columbia University Press, 1922. With a suggestive text in hand students and teachers of vocal and written English will have access to that historic region which has been a *mare clausum* to them.

B. S.
